Full and Easy

SATISFACTION,

Which is the

TRUE and SAFE

RELIGION,

In a Conference

Between { D. *A Doubter*, P. *A Papist*, and R. *A Reformed Catholick Christian.*

In four Parts:

I. The true stating of our Difference, and opening what each Religion is.

II. The true easy and full Justification of the Reformed or Protestant Religion.

III. The Protestants Reasons and charges against Popery, enumerated.

IV. The first Charge, *viz.* Against Transubstantiation made good: In which Popery is proved to be the *shame of humane Nature*, notoriously contrary to *Sense*, *Reason*, *Scripture* and *Tradition*, or the judgement of the ancient and the present Church; devised by Satan to expose Christianity to the scorn of Infidels.

By RICHARD BAXTER.

Glasgow, by *Robert Sanders*, Printer to the C
and are to be sold in his Shop, 1674.

To his Grace the Duke of Lauderdail *His Majesties Commissioner, and principal Secretary for the Kingdom of* Scotland, *&c.*

May it please your Grace,

HOnour and gratitude are affections much inclined to speak out, and to publish themselves in the predication of their objects: And seeing the Literate Tribe have long used so much boldness with great Names, as to prefix them by Dedications to their Writings, I take that advantage to tell the World how greatly your favour hath long since obliged me, and still continueth so to do. And while I can say, that I know of no Nobleman living who *hath read more of my Writings* then You have done, all that know the *end of Writing* will consent, that there is [illegible] is not as certain am

Name which I ſhould prefer. And as I long ago read in the learned *Spanhemius* his Dedication of his *Dubia Evangelica, pag.* 3. to *You* (well joyned with the famous *Uſher*) the predication of Your *Judicium ſupra ætatem maturum, rerum omnium cognitione ſubactum pectus*, and that as atteſted by the *Illuſtrious Duke* of *Rohane*, the *moſt Sagacious Arbiter of ingenies*; And years and experience have been long adding to your knowledge: being not a ſtranger to the truth of this my ſelf, I have great reaſon to be ambitious to *ſtand right in your eſteem*: (For who reverenceth the judgement of ignorant Readers? Or, doth not reverence the judgement of the Wiſe?) And therefore to give You an account of my ſelf, and of this writing;

Since I overgrew that Religion which is taken up moſt on humane truſt, by increaſing knowledge I increaſed mens diſpleaſure; and my judgement not falling juſt into the mold of *any Sect* among *Church-dividers*, there is ſcarce *any Sect* which doth not, according to their *vereſts*, ſignify their diſpleaſure.

Some

Some only by *magiſterial Cenſures*; *more credibly* acquainting the World, what they are themſelves, then what I am, or what is my judgement. But from others I take a meer ſlander for *Clemency*, and as *Philoſtratus* ſaith, *de Dicto Phavorini. Et dum Socratis cicutam non bibam, areâ privari ſtatuâ non ladit. Simple Chriſtianity is my Religion*: I determine to know nothing but Chriſt crucified (and glorified.) And I am paſt all doubt, that till ſimple Chriſtianity become the terms of *Church-Unity and Concord*, the *Church will never ſee Unity or Concord*, which ſhal prove univerſal or durable. So certain am I, that the Wits of the Learned, much leſs of the Community of vulgar Chriſtians, will never arrive at the ſtature of Concord, in numerous and difficult points: Nor the marvellous diverſity of Educations, occaſions, temperatures and capacities, be ever united in any thing but what is plain and ſimple. And as certain am I, that the Univerſal Conſcience of true Believers will never unite, in any thing which is not evidently divine. And yet as certain

am I, that the forſaking of the determination of the Holy Ghoſt and the Apoſtles, *Acts* 15.28. and of *Pauls* Deciſion, *Rom.* 14. *and* 15. hath been the *Engine* of *Church-Diviſions*, and *many calamitous diſtractions* to this day: And that that *bleſſed Prince*, who muſt have the honour and comfort of beginning the true healing and Concotd of the Churches, muſt pare off all their ſuperfluities, and leave them at beſt among their things indifferent, and unite them on the terms of *ſimple Chriſtianity*.

And as to *Popery*, I have certainly found, that the Croſs Intereſts and Paſſions of Diſputers have made us (though really too diſtant) to ſeem commonly about many Doctrinals, more diſtant then indeed we are: And that it had been better with us, if ſuch men as judicious *Ludov. le Blank*, had had the ſtating of our Controverſies at the firſt, that differing words and methods might not have paſſed with either ſide for damnable errors in the faith. I mean in the points of *fore-knowledge*, *predeſtination*, *providence*, *predetermination*, *concurſe*, *original ſin*,

ſin, *free-will*, *univerſal Redemption*, *ſufficient Grace*, *effectual Grace*, the *nature of Faith*, *Juſtification*, *Sanctification*, *Merit*, *good Works*, *Certainty of Juſtification*, and of *Salvation*, *Perſeverance*, &c. For my *knowing this to be true*, I am cenſured by thoſe on *one extream*, as too favourable to the Papiſts (being indeed an Enemy to injury, calumny, uncharitableneſs or cruelty to any in the World.) But I am much more diſpleaſing to the *Roman party*; Becauſe I know, that *One man* is naturally uncapable of being the *Monarch of all the World*: That the King of *Rome* (as the *Geographia Nubienſis* calls him) was never by Chriſt made King of Kings, and Lord of Lords: That he never was, nor can be a Paſtor at the *Antipodes*, and over all the Earth, or as far as *Drake* and *Candiſh* did navigate: That it is a ſorry Argument, [Monarchy is the beſt Government: Ergo, An univerſal Monarchy is beſt:] That the Government ſetled in Nature and Scripture, is for Princes to rule Churchmen and all, by the Sword, and the Paſtors of all particular Churches, to rule thei

Congregations by the Church-Keys; that is, by the *Word*, uſing *Synods* for due concord and correſpondency: And this much will do better, then all the ſtir that the Clergies Ambition hath made in the World.

I know that the *Pope* ſtandeth on no better a foundation then the other four Patriarchs: And that he was but the chief Prelate or Patriarch in one Empire, as the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* is in *England*. And that the Greek Church never took his Primacy in that one Empire to be of Divine Right: For if they had, they had never ſet up the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* againſt him, who never claimed his Primacy as *jure Divino*. I know that the great Council of *Chalcedon* decreed, Act. 16. Bin. 734. ["We "following always the definitions of "the holy Fathers and the Canon, have "our ſelves alſo defined the ſame "things, concerning the Priviledges of "the ſame moſt Holy Church of *Con-* "*ſtantinople*, *New Rome*; For to the Seat "of *Old Rome*, becauſe of the Empire of "that City, the Fathers conſequently

"gave

"gave the Priviledges: And the one "hundred and fifty Biſhops moſt belo- "ved of God, being moved with the "ſame intention, have given equal Pri- "viledges to the moſt Holy Seat of *new* "*Rome*: Reaſonably judging that the "City adorned with the Empire and "Senate, ſhall enjoy equal Priviledges "with old Regal *Rome*.]

I know that their late Biſhop of *Chalcedon* ſaith (againſt Biſhop *Bramhall*, *Survey*, pag. 69.) [*To us it ſufficeth, that the Biſhop of* Rome *is* S. Peters *Succeſſor; and this all Fathers teſtifie. But whether he be ſo* jure Divino vel humano, *is no point of faith.* Vid. *Bellarm.* 1. 2. *de Pont. l.* 12. And *Holden Analyſ. fid. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 161. *Multa ſunt quæ traditione univerſa firmiter innituntur (puta* S. Petrum *fuiſſe* Romæ) *quæ revelata non ſunt; ideoque ab articulorum fidei Catholicæ numero excludnntur.*

I know that there *never was* ſuch a thing as a *true Univerſal Council* in the World (unleſs Chriſt and his Apoſtles were ſuch;) nor ever *muſt, or will, or can be.*

I know that they were called *Universal*, but as to one Empire: and that Emperors called them together, who had nothing to do without that Empire; and that (unleſs accidentally any inconſiderable number) *no Churches out of the Empire* were *ſummoned*, or *ſent their Biſhops thither:* Which needs no other proof then the knowledge of the *limits* of the *Roman Empire*, and the *Notitiæ Epiſcopatuum*, and the *Names ſubſcribed* to *each Council* in *Binnius* and the reſt.

I know that long ago their *Raynerius* ſaid (*Cont. Waldenſ. Catal. in Biblioth. Patrum Tom* 4. *p.* 773.) [*The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the reſt which the Apoſtles converted, are not under the Church of* Rome.] And that *Godignus* and others, make no doubt, but the *Abaſſines* had the faith from the days of S. *Matthew* and the Eunuch.

I know that *Theodoret. Hiſtor. Sanct. Patr. c.* 1. *ſaith*, [James *the Biſhop of* Niſibis *came to the Synod of* Nice; *for* Niſibis *then obeyed the* Roman *Empire.*] Nothing can be more plain.

I know

I know that *Jacob. de Vitriaco* (and others) ſay (*Hiſt. Orient. c. 77.*) that [*the Churches of the eaſterly parts of* Aſia *alone, exceeded in number the Chriſtians, either of the Greek or Latin Churches:*] And that *Brochardus* that lived at *Jeruſalem*, ſaith, that [*thoſe called Schiſmaticks by us, are far better men then thoſe of the* Roman *Church.*]

And to perſwade the Kings of *other Kingdoms*, that the neceſſary *way of Church-Union*, is to unite all their *ſubject-Churches* under the *Patriarchs* of *another Empire*, is no wiſer then to tell *all the World* that they muſt be under the Biſhop of *Canterbury*.

I know that it was long ere *Our ancient Britains*, and eſpecially *Your Scots*, would *ſo much as eat* with the *Roman* Clergy, (as *Beda* ſheweth.)

And I *know* that their *Melch. Canus* ſaith, (*Loc. Com. cap. 7. fol.* 201.) *That not only the Greeks, but almoſt all the reſt of the Biſhops of the whole world, have fought to deſtroy the priviledges of the Church of* Rome; *And indeed they had on their ſide both the Arms of Emperors and the grea-*

ter

ier number of *Churches* : *And yet they could never prevail to abrogate the power of the one Pope of Rome.* Was *this Pope* then (or the *Roman* Church) *Univerſal?* Beſides that, *to this day*, they are but about the third or fourth part of the Chriſtian World.

And *I know* that *general Councils* are *their Religion:* and what the *general approved Council* at *Lateran ſub Innoc.* 3. hath Decreed *againſt temporal Lords and their Dominions, and abſolving of their Subjects from their Oaths of Fidelity:* Beſides what *Greg.* 7. hath ſaid in his *Concil. Rom.* of his power *to take down and ſet up Emperors.*

The *knowing* of *theſe things*, maketh me taken for their enemy. And their *Image of worſhip* in an *unknown Tongue*, with their *Bread-worſhip* and multitude of *ludicrous deceitful toyes*, are things which my ſoul can never be reconciled to: Much leſs to that renunciation of *humanity* which hereafter I detect, in the following Treatiſe.

And having given You this *account of my ſelf*, I add as to *this Treatiſe.* 1. It

grieved

grieved me to hear that *ſo many refuſed* the *Parliaments Declaration* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation:* And I deſired to ſhew them *what it is.*

2. Inſtead of joyning with thoſe who talk much of the danger of Popery in the Land; to keep it out, I thought it better to publiſh the Reaſons which ſatisfy me againſt it, and leave the ſucceſs of all to God.

3. And having occaſion to re-print the firſt Part of my *Key for Catholicks*, with Corrections, in ſtead of the Name before prefixed, of one whoſe face I never ſaw, nor ever had a word from, but ignorantly endeavoured to have provoked him to do good; I thought *Your Name* fitteſt to be gratefully ſubſtituted, who were the firſt then that checked my imprudent temerity.

Though I was not ſo vain, as to expect of late in your multitude of greater buſineſs, that You ſhould read over my more tedious Writings, I deſpair not but You may find leiſure in peruſing this, to ſee that I have prefixed Your Name to nothing, but what *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, and

and *Religion* do avow. And ſo craving Your pardon for the boldneſs and tedioufneſs of this Addreſs,

I reſt,

Your Graces humble much obliged Servant,

Auguſt 27. 1673.

RICHARD BAXTER.

TO

TO THE READER.

THis Dialogue *cometh not to you, from an apprehenſion of any extraordinary excellency of it, as if it did much more then is already done: but as extorted by mere neceſſity;* 1. *Becauſe ſo many ignorantly turn Papiſts of late;* 2. *And ſome are pleaſed* to ſay (*I dare not ſay,* to think) *that it is long of men in my condition;* 3. *And it is the art of the Papiſts (which our vanity encourageth) to ſeek to bring the old Books into oblivion (which are unanſwerable) and to call ſtill for new.*

The intended Uſe of this is, 1. *To tell thoſe that will diſpute with a Papiſt, on what terms and in what order to proceed, leſt they be cheated into a ſnare.*

2. *To teach the ignorant Doubters truly to underſtand, wherein the difference between us and the Papiſts doth indeed conſiſt; that the talk of Sectaries calling that which diſpleaſeth them,* Popery, *nor the ſcandal of our real or ſeeming diviſions, may not delude them, nor Papiſts puzzle them by putting them to prove every word in our thirty-nine Articles, or other Writings.*

3. *To reſolve all that will be reſolved, by* Senſes, Reaſon, Scripture, *or the* Judgement *and Tradition of the Church,*

Of

To the Reader.

Of the multitude of Reaſons againſt Popery enumerated, I have here made good but one, by a ſpecial diſputation; becauſe I would not make the Book too big. The reſt I ſhal eaſily prove in another Volume, if greater work and ſhortneſs of life do not hinder it; (which I fully expect.) And leſt I have no more opportunity to anſwer their Charges againſt us on the other ſide, I have reprinted and added (corrected) the firſt part of my Key for Catholicks, *where it is long ago done, and never anſwered. There is extant one Piece of theirs againſt me, unanſwered, called Mr.* Johnſons Rejoynder, *about the* Viſibility of the Church: *which I ſeriouſly profeſs I have left unanſwered, as utterly unworthy of my precious Time, till I have no greater matter to do, which I hope will never be. And he that will well ſtudy his opening of the terms in the latter end, will ſee to how pitiful a caſe they are reduced. I conclude with this ſolemn Profeſſion, That I am ſatisfied of the truth of what I write, and muſt dye ere long in the Faith which I here profeſs, and lay my hopes of endleſs happineſs on no other way: And that I would joyfully receive any ſaving Truth, from Papiſts or any other, who will bring it me, with ſuch evidence as may make it indeed my own. The Lord unite us by* Truth, Love *and* Humility. *Amen.*

Septemb. 1. 1673.

Richard Baxter.

PART. I.

What is the Protestants Religion, and what the Papists?

CHAP. I.

The occasion of the Conference.

D. SIR, I am come to crave your help in a matter of great importance to me: I was bred a Protestant; but the Discourses of some Roman Catholicks, have brought me into great doubts, whether I have not been all this while deceived: And though I cannot dispute the case my self with you, I desire you to dispute it in my hearing with a Catholick Priest whom I shal bring to you.

R. With all my heart: But let me first ask you a few Questions.

Quest. 1. Did you ever understand what the Protestants Religion is?

D. I take it to be the 39. Articles, Liturgie and Government of the Church of *England*.

R. No wonder if you be easily drawn to doubt of that Religion, which you no bet-

ter

ter understand. Can you hold it, and not know what it is?

Quest. 2. Do you know what it is to be a Christian?

D. It is to believe in Christ, and to Love and obey Him. Our Baptism is our Christening.

R. Very true: And in your Baptism you are dedicated and vowed to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, renouncing the lusts of the Flesh, the World, and the Devil.

Quest. 3. And have you been a true Christian, and lived according to this vow? Have you obeyed God more then the desires of your flesh? Have you preferred the Kingdom of Heaven before all the pleasures, honours and riches of this World? Have you sincerely submitted to the healing saving Doctrine, Law and example of Christ, and to the sanctifying motions of his Holy Spirit? And have you lived soberly, righteously, and Godlily in the World; and made it your care and business to deny your self, and mortifie all fleshly inordinate desires, as it is the care of sensual men to gratifie them?

D. I have had my faults as all men have; but I hope none can say but I have lived honestly towards all; And if I have been faulty in drinking, sports or gaming, it hath been to no ones injury but my own.

R. I ask you not whether you are a *ſinner*; For ſo are all men. But whether you are a *truly penitent, converted ſinner*; and whether yet you are true to your *Baptiſmal vow and covenant?* Can your Conſcience ſay, that you *Love, and Truſt and obey God*, and your *Redeemer*, before all the World; and that you love not Pleaſure, Riches and Honor, more then God, and Holineſs, and Heaven? and that it is more of the care and buſineſs of your life, to know and love, and ſerve God better, and to make ſure of your ſalvation, then to pleaſe your fleſh, or proſper in the World? In a word; Do you heartily and in your practiſe, take God for your God, even for your all, and Chriſt for your Teacher, King and Saviour, and the Holy Ghoſt for your Sanctifier, turning in heart and life from the Devil, the world, and the ſinful pleaſures of the fleſh? This is the queſtion which I deſire you to anſwer.

Johnſ. Nov. Repr. pag. 426. Proteſtants formally ſuch, have not enough to be brought to the unfeigned Love of God above al things, and ſpecial love to his ſervants, and unfeigned willingneſs to obey him: I deny you have any certain knowledge or feeling that you love God or his ſervants, or willingneſs to obey, &c.

But I will prevent your anſwer, leſt you miſtake my purpoſe, and think I make my ſelf your Confeſſor, and I will tell you why I ask the queſtion. Either

Either you have thus kept your *baptiſmal vow* by a *Godly life*, or elſe you have *broken it* by worldlineſs and ſenſuality, &c. If you have *kept it*, and are a truly *Godly perſon*, you have reſolved your own doubt, and abſolutely confuted Popery already. For no honeſt man and true Chriſtian can poſſibly turn Papiſt without groſs contradiction.

D. How prove you that?

R. Moſt eaſily: I pray you do but mark: 1. It is their principal Doctrine, that the Pope is the Head of the univerſal Church on earth; and that the Church ſubjected to him, is the univerſal Church; and that out of that Church there is no ſalvation; and that no one is a true member of Chriſt and his Church, who is not a ſubject of the Pope.

2. And they all confeſs that every one ſhal be ſaved that is a true Chriſtian, and keepeth his Baptiſmal Covenant, and that loveth God above all. So that they muſt needs hold that none in the world but Papiſts, do truly love God and keep that Covenant, and are true Chriſtians.

Now if you can know that you have the true love of God, and are true to your Baptiſm, you muſt needs confeſs that Popery is falſe, which ſaith, that none love God above all but Papiſts.

D. But what if I have not loved God, and obeyed him, above my fleſh? *R.* I'le

R. I'le tell you what followeth. 1. It is no wonder if you forsake the Protestants Religion, who never truly entertained it. If your *Heart and Life* were not *devoted unfeignedly to God*, you were *no true Christian*, nor indeed had any true Religion at all: And he that hath no Religion, turneth from none which he truly had. If you were never a *true Christian*, you were never a *true Protestant*: And then what wonder if you turn Papist? For you have no *experimental knowledge* of that Religion which you seem to forsake.

2. And how could you expect better, but that God should penally forsake you, and give you over to believe deceits, if you have dealt so falsly and deceitfully with him, as to live to the world and flesh which you renounced, and neglect that God and Savior and Sanctifier to whom you were so solemnly devoted? And if you have been so treacherous and unwise, as to prefer a brutish transitory pleasure, before Gods love and the joys of Heaven?

3. And what honor is it to the Church of *Rome*, that none but infidels and false-hearted Hypocrites, and perfidious-breakers of their Covenant with God, did ever turn to them? If you turn Papist, you confess that you were a wicked Hypocrite before.

4. But the chief thing which I would tell you is, that turn up and down as oft as you will,

will, to this Church or that Church, to this ſide or that ſide, you will never be ſaved, unleſs you become a *holy, ſerious, mortified Chriſtian:* As long as you love pleaſures, wealth, and honor, more then God and Holineſs, and Heaven, you ſhal never be ſaved, whether you be Papiſt, or a profeſſed Proteſtant. It would make the heart of a Chriſtian ake, to ſee ſo many thouſands cheated by the Devil, to take this opinion or that opinion, called *the true Faith*, and this ſide or that ſide, called *the true Church*, to be to them in ſtead of a *holy heavenly heart and life*. And how many thouſands, eſpecially Papiſts, that are truly of *no Religion*, do diſpute, and plot, and diſquiet the World, as for Religion. To hear a prophane man ſwear that his Religion is right; or that man to think to be ſaved for being of the true Church and Faith, whoſe heart was never ſet on Heaven, but liveth in drunkenneſs, lying, idleneſs, fornication, and thinketh that the Prieſts abſolution ſets all right again. Without true Holineſs no man ſhal be ſaved, what Church ſoever he joyn with; and with it no man ſhal be damned. For God cannot hate them that have his nature and image.

D. Well, Sir, I came not to diſpute with you, but to deſire you to meet a Roman Catholick Prieſt, that I may hear you both together.

R. I have the greater hopes of you, becauſe you have ſo much regard of your ſoul, as to be willing to hear what can be ſaid. For moſt that turn to them, never come to an impartial tryal, but raſhly follow the deceiver, or ſtay till they are ſecretly hardened by falſe inſinuations, and then take on them to deſire to hear both, when they are firſt reſolved to be gone.

But you muſt tell me what is the queſtion that you deſire ſhould be diſputed?

D. I would know whether the Papiſts or the Proteſtants be the True, and ſafe Religion?

R. I undertake to give you that plain undenyable evidence for your reſolution, which ſhould fully ſatisfie any reaſonable man, at leaſt that profeſſeth himſelf a Chriſtian: ſo be it you will perform theſe reaſonable conditions: 1. That you will be impartially willing to know the truth. 2. That you will honeſtly reſolve to live according to it when you know it, and to be true to the true Religion. 3. That you will bring ſuch a man to confer with me, who will yield to the reaſonable conditions of a diſputant, ſuch as your doubt and the nature of the matter doth notoriouſly require, and not a Knave, and ſtudied Deceiver, who will ſet himſelf purpoſely to hide the truth.

D. Theſe

D. These conditions are so reasonable, that I must not deny them.

CHAP. II.

The conditions of the Conference between a P. *and* R. *and* D.

R. SIr, I am desired by this person, who is brought by some of you to doubt of our Religion, to debate this Case with you in order to his satisfaction, *Whether the Papists or the Protestants* be the *True* and *safe Religion*?

P. That is too large a question: We cannot dispute of all our Religion at once: I will begin with you, about some one of the Articles of the Church of *England*, or the visibility of your Church in all ages, or the resolution of your faith, &c. And this I will do only on these conditions, 1. That you bring some express Text of Scripture, which without your interpretation, reasonings or consequences, doth assert that Article of yours which I shal accuse, or contradict any Article of our Faith, which shal be questioned. 2. Or if you will go from the express words to reasoning, that we keep to the strictest rules of Logick, and that you use nothing but Syllogism, and that all be done in writing, and not by word of mouth.

R. Neighbour *D.* you promised me to bring another

another kind of Diſputant: You hear his conditions: you ſhal hear my anſwer.

1. The Caſe which you told me you were in doubt of, and deſired ſatisfaction in, was *which is the true and ſafe Religion?* This he refuſeth to diſpute. Pretending that we cannot diſpute of our whole Religion at once. But did you never hear him give any Reaſons againſt our Religion? If he have, Why can he not do it now? I expect not all in a word, but let him give them one by one, and ſay his worſe. I am ſure I can give you many againſt theirs: And we will after debate them particularly as largely as you pleaſe.

2. If *Writing* be it that you deſire for your ſatisfaction, I ask you, whether you have read all, or the fourth part, of what is written againſt Popery already? Have you read Dr. *Challoner* of the Catholick Church? Dr. *White*, Dr. *Field*, Dr. *Downame* of Antichriſt, *Chillingworth*, Dr. *Abbot*, Dr. *Willet*, Biſhop *Uſher*, Biſhop *Morton*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and an hundred more? Why ſhould I expect that you ſhould read what I ſhal write, if you will not read what is written already?

3. Can you ſtay ſo long unreſolved without injury to your ſoul, till he and I have done writing? You cannot but know, that from Sheets we muſt proceed to the writing of Volumes, in anſwering each other, as others have

done. And this is like to be many years worlt for men that have other buſineſs: And ho know you that we ſhal all live ſo long?

4. Are you able when it cometh to tediou Volumes to examine them, and find who is i the right? Or will you not rather take him t conquer, who hath the laſt word? And it like that will be the longeſt liver?

5. And as to a ſtrict ſyllogiſtical form, d you underſtand that beſt? I avoid it not, bu ſhal conſent to uſe it as far as you underſtan it. Do you know all the Logical forms of ar guing, all Moods and Figures, and all the fal lacies? Or do you not perceive, that you have broken your promiſe with me, and brought a friend of darkneſs, who cometh purpoſely to hide the truth?

D. I muſt needs profeſs, that the Queſtion which I would have debated, is, *Which is the True and Safe Religion?* And that it is not tedious writings, nor long delays, but preſent conference which muſt ſatisfie me. And that it is plain Scripture and Reaſon that muſt ſatisfie me, who underſtand not Logick. I pray let me hear your own conditions which you think more juſt.

R. The Conditions which the nature of the cauſe directeth us to, are theſe:

1. That we firſt truly ſtate the queſtion to be diſputed: For we cannot diſpute till we are

are agreed of what: That is, 1. That we agree what we mean by our *Religion*; and, 2. That I tell you, what is the Religion of Protestants, which I undertake to defend: And that he tell us what is the Religion of the Romanists, which must be compared with it.

II. That our Conference consist of these several parts.

1. That premising the principles in which we are agreed, I tell you the reasons why you should not be a Papist.

2. That he tell you the reasons why you should turn Papist, or what he hath against our Religion.

3. That then we come to dispute these Reasons distinctly: where I will prove my charges against them, and he shal prove his charges against us one by one.

III. And that in all our disputes, we shall consent, 1. Not to interrupt each other in speech; but if the length seem to overmatch the hearers memory, we will take brief notes to help our memories, as we go, and crave the recitation of what shal be forgotten: For the strength of Truth lyeth so much in the connexion of its parts, that when it is mangled into scraps by uncivil interruptions, it is deformed and debilitated and cannot be well understood.

2. That we bind our selves by solemn pro-

miſe, to ſpeak nothing which we unfeignedly judge not to be truth, nor any thing deſignedly to hide or reſiſt the truth which we diſcern.

Theſe terms are ſo juſt and neceſſary, that I will avoid him as a fraudulent wrangler who will deny them. For I come not to ſcold, nor to try who hath the ſtrongeſt Lungs, the nimbleſt Tongue, or the lowdeſt voice, or the greateſt confidence, or fierceſt paſſion; but to try who hath the truth, and which is the true way to Heaven. For the ſervant of the Lord muſt not ſtrive; eſpecially about words and barren notions; for that doth but tend to increaſe ungodlineſs.

D. Your method is ſo reaſonable, and ſo ſuited to my own neceſſity, that I muſt profeſs no other can ſo much tend to my ſatisfaction: And therefore I hope it will not be refuſed.

Here after long oppoſition, the *P.* at laſt agreeth to theſe terms.

CHAP. III.

What is the Religion of the Proteſtants?

R. 1. THe word [*Religion*] is ſometimes taken *objectively*; And ſo I mean by it, [*The objects of religious Belief, Love and Practiſe,*] which are, 1. The *things themſelves*; which

which are the *principal objects* (called by Logicians, The incomplex terms.) 2. The *organical object*; or the *Revelation* of these things; containing, 1. The *words* or other *signs*: 2. The *sense* or *notions* signified.

For instance, Matth. 17. 5. *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* Here 1. The *real incomplex object* is *Christ himself*, the beloved Son of God, and God the Fathers well-pleasedness in him. 2. The *signal* part of the organical object, or revelation, is the *words* themselves, as spoken then, and written now. 3. The *signified notions* are the *meaning* of the words, and are the chief part of the *organical object*, that is the *Divine Revelation*.

The word *Religion* is of larger extent in its sense then *Faith*; For it containeth all that Revelation which God hath made necessary to salvation, which is two-fold. 1. That which is to inform the *understanding* with necessary *knowledge* and *faith*. 2. That which is necessary to a holy Will and a holy Life; to the love of God and man, and to well-doing; which are Precepts, Promises & Threatnings.

II. The word *Religion*, is oft taken also *subjectively*, as they speak, For the *acts* and *habits* of *love* and *obedience*.

Now I suppose we are agreed, that it is not *Religion* in this last sense that we are to dispute of, which is as divers as persons are: But it is

that which we call *objective* Religion, even the *organical part* directly. And if by all this *D.* understandeth us not, in plainer words, our question is, *Of the True Divine* Revelation, viz. *Which is the true rule of Faith, Will and Practise*; that which is held to be such by the Protestants: or that which is held to be such by the Papists?

P. I grant you, that this is the state of the question.

R. I here declare to you then, *What is the* Religion *of the Protestants.* [*It is the Light and Law of God, concerning holy Knowledge and Belief, holy Will and Practise, contained in nature and the true canonical Scriptures.*

Here note, 1. That our Religion hath its *essential* parts; And its *integral* parts and *accidentals.* I. The *Essentials* of our *Religion*, are contained in the *baptismal Covenant*; which is expounded in the *Creed*, the *Lords Prayer*, and the *Decalogue*, as delivered and expounded by *Christ*, and the *Law of Nature.*

II. Our *entire* Religion, in the *Essentials*, *Integrals*, and *needful Accidentals*, is contained wholly in the *Law of Nature*, and the *Canonical Scriptures.*

The *Essentials* are delivered down to us two ways: 1. In *Scripture* with the rest; 2. By the *sure tradition* of the *universality of Christians*, in *actual Baptizings*, and the *daily*

pro-

profeſſion of Chriſtianity. This is *all the Proteſtants* Religion. If you faſten any other on us, we deny it; we own no other. And none know what is *my* Religion; that is, *What I take for the rule of my holy Faith, Love and Life*, ſo well as *my ſelf.*

P. This is meer craft: you will make that only which is paſt controverſy among us, to be *your* Religion, that ſo your Religion may be paſt controverſie too.

R. It is ſuch craft as containeth that *naked truth*, which we truſt all our own ſalvation on. I ſay that *I have no other* Religion; And if you know better then I, diſprove me.

P. I diſprove you three ways. I. Becauſe the *Name Proteſtant* ſignifieth no ſuch Religion, but ſomewhat elſe lately taken up. II. Becauſe the *Auguſtane Confeſſion*, *the thirty nine Articles* and ſuch like, are by your ſelves called, *The Articles of your* Religion. III. Becauſe all your Writings declare, that beſides theſe, you hold all thoſe *controverted points*, which are contrarie to that which you call Popery.

R. I pray you mark *D.* that he would perſwade you, that *he knoweth my* Religion better then *I do my ſelf.* What if I ſhould pretend the like as to *his* Religion? Were I to be believed?

P. No: but if you have an odd Religion of your own, that proveth it not to be the *Proteſtant* Religion.

R. Re-

R. Remember D. that *I come not hither to perſwade you* to any other Religion, then this which I have mentioned. Let him talk as long as he will what is *other mens opinions*, *I perſwade you to nothing but this*, to take *Gods Law of Nature* and the *Scripture for your* Religion. Either this is *right* or *wrong*. If *right*, fix here and I have done. If *wrong*, let that be diſputed.

But yet I open to you all his three deceits.

I, The name *Proteſtant* doth not ſignifie *our* Religion, but our *proteſting* againſt the *Papiſts corruptions* and *additions*. I have no Religion but Chriſtianity: *I am a Chriſtian*, and that ſignifieth *all my* Religion. I am a *Catholick Chriſtian*; that is, of the *common Chriſtian Faith and Church*, and not of any *heretical dividing Sect*: And I am a *Reformed Proteſtant Chriſtian*, becauſe *I renounce Popery*. Therefore I rather ſay, *The Proteſtants*, then the *Proteſtant* Religion. As if I were among Lepers; If I ſay, *I am no Leper*, that ſignifieth not my *eſſence*: But

Knot againſt Chillingworth Ch. 2. pag. 122. In no one Doctrine Proteſtants would ſeem more unanimouſly to agree, then in this, That all things neceſſary to ſalvation are contained evidently in Scripture--which they hold as the only foundation of the whole ſtructure of their Faith and Religion. *Note this Confeſſion.*

But if I ſay, *I am a Man*, and *I am not a Leper*; I ſpeak *my Nature*, and *my freedom* from that *diſeaſe*. So if I ſay, I am a *Chriſtian Proteſtant*, I mean only that I am a *Chriſtian*, and *no Papiſt*, or renouncing *Popery*; as by the word *Catholick*, I renounce *all Sects and Schiſms*. I tell you, *This is my meaning*, when I ſay, *I am a Proteſtant*: and can you tell *my meaning* better then *my ſelf*?

II. And as to what he ſaith of the *thirty nine Articles*, and other Church Confeſſions, I anſwer, *None of theſe are our* Religion, in the ſenſe now in queſtion; that is, They are not taken by us to be *the Divine revealed-rule of our Faith, Love and Life*, which is *our* Religion now diſputed of. And that this is ſo, I prove to you paſt all queſtion.

For 1. Elſe ſhould we have as *many* Religions as we have *Church Confeſſions*, and ſhould *alter* our Religion as oft as we alter our *Confeſſions*; and our Religion ſhould be as *New* as thoſe *Confeſſions*: All which the Proteſtants abhor.

2. All thoſe very Confeſſions themſelves do aſſert that *Gods Word is our only* Religion, and all mens Writings and Decrees are lyable to miſtakes: To paſs by all the reſt, theſe are the words of our ſixth Article, *Holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to ſalvation: ſo that whatſoever is not read therein, nor may be proved*

thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. What would you have more plain and full?

And in the Book of Ordination, it is askt, 'Are you perswaded that the holy Scriptures 'contain sufficiently all doctrine required of 'necessity for eternal salvation, through faith 'in Jesus Christ? And are you determined out 'of the said Scriptures to instruct the people 'committed to your charge? and to teach 'nothing (as required of necessity to eternal 'salvation) but that which you shal be per-'swaded may be concluded and proved by 'the Scripture? Is not this plain?

P. Why then do you call the thirty-nine Articles the *Articles of your Religion?* And what is their use? And why are all required to subscribe them?

R. 1. Their use is to signifie how the conjunct Pastors who use them, do *understand* the Holy Scriptures in *those points*: And that partly for the satisfaction of all forraign Churches, who may hear us accused of heresie or error; and partly to be a hedge to the Doctrine of young Preachers, to keep them from vending mistakes in the Churches, and also to try the soundness of their understandings.

2. The Confessions, and Articles, and Catechisms are our Religion, as the writings of

Perron,

Perron, *Bellarmine*, *Suarez*, &c. or *many* of theſe agreeing, are the Roman Religion: They are not the *Divine Revelation and rule of Faith and practiſe* to us: But they are the expreſſion of our own conceptions of the ſenſe of ſeveral chief matters in that rule or Revelation. So that they are the *expreſſion of our Faith or* Religion *taken ſubjectively*, for *acts and habits*, and not our *objective rule it ſelf*. Our *Sermons* and *Prayers* are our Religion in this ſenſe: that is, *The expreſſion of our own religious conceptions*: And ſo are *your Sermons* and *your Writings* alſo to you. But if this were our *rule of Faith and Life*, and ſo our *Divine objective* Religion, then we ſhould be of as *many* Religions, as we are *ſeveral perſons*: For every one hath his ſeveral expreſſions: And every new Sermon, or Book, or Prayer, would be a new part of Religion. And ſo with you alſo. So that this doubt is paſt all doubt: Our Confeſſions are but the expreſſions of our perſonal belief, and not our rule of Faith.

III. And as to your third pretence, that we have other Articles as oppoſite to Popery? I anſwer, *Our* Religion as a *rule of Faith* and *worſhip* is *one thing*: And our *rejecting* all *Corruptions* and *Additions* is *another*. *E. g.* My Religion is, that *our God is only the true God*. If now I ſay alſo, that *Hercules* is not God, and

Bacchus

Bacchus is not God, and *Venus*, *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Pallas*, *Neptune*, *Pluto*, *Ceres*, *&c.* are not Gods; is this a *new* Religion, or an *addition* to the former? If the *Baptiſmal Covenant* be the *Eſſentials* of my Religion, and the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer and Decalogue* the *Explication* of it; and if the *Scripture* be my *entire* Religion, and if the Papiſts will come and add a multitude of *new Articles* and *Corruptions*, my rejecting of thoſe *additions*, is no more an alteration of my Religion, then the ſweeping of my houſe, or the waſhing of my hands is an alteration of them. So that notwithſtanding all that you have ſaid, my Religion is nothing but the *Law of Nature and Scripture*, and my rejecting of popery, is no otherwiſe my Religion, then my *freedom from the Leproſie*, *&c.* is my *humanity*.

P. Obſerve, I pray you, that it is no part of your Religion to be againſt Popery.

R. Obſerve, I pray you, that *Popery* is *againſt my* Religion; that is, againſt much of the Chriſtian Religion; and therefore *my* Religion *is againſt Popery*. But I will not quarrel with you about words: When God hath revealed to us his *Will*, and the Papiſts add their corrupting inventions, *Gods revealed Will is my* Religion: your *corrupting additions* are contrary to it; Call my rejecting ſuch *corruptions* and *additions*, by the *name* of *my* Religion reductively

ly (as *Nihil* is *objectum Intellectus*, & *Malum Voluntatis*; and as *non-agere* is part of obedience;) or call it *no part of my* Religion in the *primary notion*, but a *rejecting of its contraries*; ſo we underſtand each other I care not.

The truth is, the *rejecting of ſome* of your errors, directly contradicting the Scripture it ſelf, may be called *part of our* Religion, as the negation of the contrary is included in the ſenſe of an affirmative: But your *remoter additions*, are contrary to our Religion, but not ſo directly. For inſtance, when the Scripture ſaith, *There is bread after conſecration*, and you ſay, *There is no bread*: My Religion containeth the aſſertion, that *there is bread*: And ſo includeth a contradiction to your negative, that ſaith, *there is none*. Now to ſay, that it is none of my Religion to deny your negative, who ſay *there is no bread*, would import that it is none of my Religion, which affirmeth that *there is bread*. Contradictions cannot both be true: Properly that word that ſaith, *There is bread*, is my Religion: But this word contradicteth you that ſay, *There is none*.

But in another inſtance, my Religion ſaith, *that the righteous ſhal go into life everlaſting*, and *the reſt to everlaſting puniſhment*; and tells us of a *Heaven and Hell only* hereafter: And you tell us of *Limbus Patrum & Infantum*, and of *Purgatory*:

gatory: The Scripture enableth us by conſequence to confute this: but if it did not, it were enough for me to ſay, *It is none of my Religion*, becauſe not revealed by God in *Nature* or *Scripture*: And as it is *your addition*, ſo to *deny* it, is not *directly* and *properly* my *Religion* it ſelf, but the *defence* and *uſe* of my Religion. God tells us in Scripture, that *He created Heaven and Earth*. If one ſhould aſſert as from God, that God created *ten thouſand Heavens, and ten thouſand Earths*, this is a *faith* of his own invention or addition, and it is enough for me to ſay, *I have no ſuch faith*; becauſe God revealeth no ſuch thing. So that ſtill the *Scripture* is the Proteſtants Religion, as your *Polydor Virgil* truly deſcribeth them, and others confeſs.

P. All this is meer deluſion: For it is not the *words*, but the *ſenſe* that is *your* *Religion*; as you will confeſs. And if your Articles or Confeſsions contain a *falſe ſenſe*, or your Books or Sermons ſhew that you *falſly expound* the Scripture, your Religion is then falſe.

R. Such confuſion may cheat a heedleſs hearer: But any one that will take heed, may quickly perceive, that you here fraudulently play with the ambiguity of the word [*Religion*] and quite turn to another queſtion. For you now *ſpeak* of *ſubjective* *Religion*, that is, of the

the *acts* and *habits* of the *person*: whereas we are disputing only of *objective* Religion, which is *Gods revelation and our rule*. If I *understand* any Texts of Scripture amiss, *my faith* is so far defective in *my self*. But *Gods Word*, which is my *rule*, is never the more imperfect.

I pray you consider how justly you have spoken. 1. Is a mans *Act of faith*, *Gods Word* or *revelation*? 2. What need you dispute of the *Protestants* Religion, if we have as *many* Religions as *persons*? For it is as certain that we have as many degrees of our *understanding many Texts* of Scripture? 3. Would not this prove also as *many* Religions as *persons* among *your selves*? Is it not most certain that no two Papists in the world, have just the same sense or conceptions of the *Scriptures* and *Councils in each particular*. The *Law of God* is my only Religion, *objectively*, as now disputed of: If I *mistake any essential* part of it, so as to deny it, I am *personally a Heretick*: If I mistake any *integral* part, I so far err from the *rule* of my Religion or *Faith*. But I still profess, that I take Gods Word or Law only for my sure unchangeable *rule or objective* Religion, and I am daily learning to understand it better, and as soon as I see my error I will reform it, and blame *my self* and not *my rule*. And I think you will say the same of *your rule* and of *your personal errors*.

P. This ſhal not ſerve your turn: For every Law muſt have its *promulgation*: And if it be not *manifeſted* to you that Scripture is Gods Law, and ſufficient, it cannot be *your* rule: I ask you therefore.

Queſt. 1. Is it the Scripture in the *Original*, or in the *Tranſlations*, which you ſay is your *Religion*, *Law* or *rule*?

R. I told you our Divine Rule conſiſteth of *Words* and *Meaning*. It is only the *Originals* which are our rule or Religion, as to the very words; that is, Only the *original words*, were of that *Divine inſpiration*. But everie *Tranſlation* is ſo far *Gods Word*, in *ſenſe*, as it expreſſeth truly the ſenſe of the original words.

P. Queſt. 2. I pray you, what then is the Religion of all the unlearned Proteſtants, who know not a word of the *originals*? They may ſee now that you have ſtript them of all *Divine* Religion.

R. Their Religion is the ſame *objectively* with that of the moſt learned, as *delivered from God*; but it is not *equally learned* and underſtood by them; *Gods Word* in the *original Tongues* is given them as the Rule of *Faith* and *Worſhip*; and *Teachers* are appointed to help them to underſtand it. When theſe *Teachers* have tranſlated it to them, they have the ſame ſenſe, though not the ſame words, for their Religion. And to know the *Words* is not ſo neceſſary

neceſſary to ſalvation, as to know the ſenſe or ſentence, though by other words: For the words are but means to know the ſenſe; and the ſenſe but a means to know the things, *viz.* God, Chriſt, Grace, Glory, &c. And as they have the ſame *God*, *Chriſt*, *Spirit*, *Grace*, *Glory*, &c. to be the real objects of their Religion, ſo have they the ſame Doctrine and Law in ſenſe which is in the originals.

P. Queſt. 3. And I pray you, How ſhal the unlearned be ſure that the tranſlations are true as to the ſenſe? when you have no Divine infallible Tranſlators?

R. I alſo ask you, 1. How was all the Greek Church for many hundred years ſure of the ſoundneſs of the Tranſlation called the Septuagint? or that of *Aquila*, *Theodot*, *Symmachus*, &c. when it is certain that in many things they were all unſound?

2. How was the Latine Church ſure of the ſoundneſs of their Tranſlation before *Hierome* amended it? And how have you been ſure ſince then, when Pope *Sixtus*, and Pope *Clement* have made ſo many hundred alterations or differences? Had you then infallible Tranſlators? And why then do your Tranſlators (as *Montanus* and others) ſtill differ from that *vulgar Latine*?

3. And how do all your unlearned perſons know that you give them not only the true ſenſe

ſenſe of the Scriptures, but of all your Councils or Traditions?

But I will anſwer you directly. We ſtill diſtinguiſh the *eſſentials* of our *Religion*, from the *Integrals* and *Accidentals*. 1. The *unlearned* may be *certain* that the *eſſentials* are truly delivered them in ſenſe: Becauſe they have them not only in the Scripture, but by univerſal certain Tradition, in the conſtant uſe of Chriſtian Baptiſm, and in the uſe of the Creed, Lords Prayer, and Decalogue, in all the Church-aſſemblies: And they may eaſily know that mens tempers, Countreys, Intereſts, opinions in other points, and ſidings, are ſo various, that it is not a thing poſsible without a miracle, that all theſe ſhould conſpire both in a falſe Tranſlation, and univerſal aſſertion and tradition of all theſe eſſentials. For the effects muſt be contrary to a torrent of cauſes: The Papiſts, Proteſtants, Arrians, Greeks, Socinians, Lutherans, Calviniſts, Anabaptiſts, Separatiſts, *&c.* have ſo much animoſity againſt each other, that undoubtedly if any party of them did falſifie Scripture, even in the eſſentials which are eaſily diſcerned, multitudes would quickly detect it and contradict them. And this the *unlearned* may ſurely and eaſily diſcern.

But as for all other *leſs neceſſary Texts* of Scripture, neither *you* nor *we*, *learned* or *unlearned*,

learned are *certain* that they are *perfectly translated*, nor are they by any one *perfectly understood*, nor are they sure (by reason of the *various readings*) which copie of the original is absolutely faultless.

2. But suppose that an unlearned weak Believer were not absolutely certain, as he may be, that the very essentials of Christianity are truly opened to him, he may yet grow up to better understanding, and he may be saved with *some doubtings of Christianity* it self, so be it his Faith be more prevalent then those doubtings, upon his heart and life.

P. Is it a safe Religion which you your self describe? When no man can be sure that he rightly understandeth all the Scriptures? and when your Believer is uncertain, even of Christianity it self? Let *D.* judge whether this be a sure Religion.

R. The Word of God is *absolutely certain in it self*; but that so much uncertainty may be in *Believers*, I will make you to your shame confess your self, and recant these insinuations.

Quest. 1. Dare you say that *all your Church*, or *any one man*, even the *Pope himself*, doth understand *all the Scripture*? or *can perfectly* and *infallibly translate each word*? You dare not say it. Else why did he never once pretend to give us either an unerring Commentary or tran-

tranſlation? And why have you ſuch great diverſity of both?

Queſt. 2. How much leſs dare you ſay, that any of you perfectly underſtand *all the Councils*, which are the reſt of your Religion? No, nor that you have *certainty* which are the *true Copies* of them all? elſe why do *Caranza*, *Crab*, *Surius*, *Binnius*, *Nicolinus*, &c. give us ſuch various Copies? And yet you confeſs the *Scriptures* to be *Gods word*, and with the *Councils* to contain *your* Religion.

Queſt. 3. If God have *promiſed ſalvation*, to all that truly hold and practiſe the *Eſſentials* (the *Baptiſmal Covenant*) doth the difficulty of other points in Genealogie, Chronologie, Hiſtory, by-matters, either make our ſalvation ever the leſs certain, or any way impeach the Word of God? What diſgrace is it to a man that beſides *Head* and *Heart*, he hath fingers, and toes, and nails and hair? No more is it to the Scripture, that as our *entire* Religion, it containeth even *Integrals* and *Accidentals*.

Queſt. 4. And as to a *doubting Believer*, I ask, Dare you ſay that all thoſe were infidels, or in a ſtate of damnation, who ſaid, *Lord, increaſe our faith?* or *Lord, we believe; help our unbelief*? or to whom Chriſt ſaid, *Why are ye afraid, O ye of*

See the Roman *Catech.* where this is confeſt, *cap.* 1. *q.* 1. *p.* 9.

of little faith? or that ſaid, Luke 24. *We truſted that thu had been he that ſhould have delivered Iſrael?* Or if a man ſhould doubt even of the *life to come*, and yet his *faith* be ſo much more powerful then his *doubts*, as that he reſolveth to prefer his *hopes of Heaven* before all this World, and to ſeek it on the moſt ſelf-denying terms, even to the laying down of life it ſelf, are you ſure that this *man ſhal be damned?* But this is the courſe of pieviſh wranglers. To maintain their own opinions, and put a face of certainty on their own concluſions, they ſtick not to damn almoſt all the World. For it will be no leſs, if all doubting Believers muſt be damned.

5. It is a groſs deluſion to pretend that there is a neceſsity, that *all Gods infallible word*, muſt needs be taught us by as *infallible inſpired Prophets* or other perſons, as thoſe that firſt delivered it. See Dr. *Holden Analiſ. fidei*, lib. 1. c. 3. lett. 1. Tranſlation is but the firſt part of expoſition. And muſt we have none but *infallible* or *prophetical Expoſitors?*

6. Is it *all the Scriptures*, or but *ſome part*, that your Pope or Councils can *infallibly* both tranſlate and expound? If *but ſome*, we need not their infallibility or inſpiration, for the moſt plain and neceſſary parts: It is and can be done without them. If it be *all*, how impious and cruel are they that would never do it to this day?

7. And

7. And why uſe all your Expoſitors the common helps of Grammars, Lexicons, Teachers, long ſtudies, and yet differ *de fide*, even of the ſenſe of many a Text of Scripture; when all is done, if your Pope have the gift of infallible tranſlating and expounding all?

P. Remember that your ſelves derive your *eſſentials* from *tradition*.

R. Yes, and our integrals too: What objective preſence to the ſenſes (eyes and ears) of thoſe that heard Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and ſaw their miracles was to the firſt Converts in thoſe times, that partly *tradition* is to us, or the neceſſary *medium*. The *words* could not come down to us, without ſome to deliver them. We have the *Bible* by *Tradition*, and we have *practical Tradition of Baptiſm*, and the *Creed by it ſelf*, and that in many languages; where we are ſure we have all the neceſſary ſenſe. But do you remember that this is *univerſal Tradition*, and not *meer* Roman *Tradition*; ſuch as is *certain* by *moral evidence*, even the *conſent of all* that are yet of *croſs opinions and intereſts*, (as to matter of fact;) *Hiſtorical Evidence*; and not the pretended *certainty of a Pope* and his *fa-*

He that would know what ſtreſs we lay on Tradition, as the *medium* may ſee it fully in my *Reaſons of Chriſt. Relig.* And Dr. *Holden* is more for us then for the Papiſts, *cap.* 3.

favorites, phanatically claiming a ſpirit of infallibility.

But I am not now diſputing with you I am only telling you that the *Proteſtant* Religion is *nothing but Chriſtianity and the Scriptures*. And all our *Confeſſions* are our Religion (beſides *Conſent*) but as our *Sermons* and *Treatiſes* are, which vary as they are various expreſsions of mens various ſubjective faith; while Gods Word varyeth not.

P. If the Bible be your Religion, then the ceremonial Law of *Moſes* is your Religion: For that is part of the Bible.

R. You ſtudy what to ſay againſt another, and never think how it concerneth your ſelves. 1. Is not the Bible at leaſt part of your Religion? You dare not deny it. And is the ceremonial Law of *Moſes* therefore *your* Religion?

2. I told you that as a *perfect man* hath *hair* and *nails*, which are but *Accidents*, ſo the Bible hath more then the integrals of our Religion.

3. The *Ceremonies* of *Moſes* in that ſenſe as now they are delivered to us in the Bible, are parts or appartenances of our Religion: That is, the *hiſtorical narrative* of thoſe *Abrogated Laws*, which now bind us not as Laws, but tell us (as the Propheſies) what was heretofore, and how Chriſt was fore-typified, and what

what intimations of Gods-will we may gather from the hiſtory. And the abrogated Laws are no otherwiſe delivered to us, and ſo we muſt uſe them.

P. If the ten Commandments be your Religion, you muſt keep the Jewiſh ſeventh day Sabbath: ſo that neither there can you fix.

R. The ſame anſwer will ſerve. 1. The ten Commandments are no otherwiſe part of our Religion then they are of yours. 2. They are a *Law to us*, as delivered and expounded by *Chriſt*, and in *Nature*: and the ſeventh day is an abrogated part of *Moſes* Law.

P. If the *Creed* be your Religion, you muſt take the Article of Chriſts deſcent into Hell to be neceſſary to ſalvation.

R. 1. Is the *Creed* no part of *your* Religion? As you anſwer, ſo may we. 2. I did not tell you that the Creed had *no more* then the *eſſentials*. I told you that all the *eſſence* of Chriſtianity is in the *Baptiſmal Covenant*: And he that underſtandeth *that*, underſtandeth *it all*. And that the *Creed*, the *Lords Prayer*, and the *Chriſtian Decalogue*, are the *expoſition* of it. But the expoſition may have *ſomewhat more* then the *eſſentials*. 3. The *Creed* was not written firſt in Engliſh, nor Latine; And Chriſts deſcent to *Hades* is more needful to be believed, then his deſcent to *Hell*, as the word is commonly taken in Engliſh.

But

But to conclude, remember, 1. That I profeſs here to own and plead for *no other Religion* (as we explained the word) but *Gods Law of Nature and Scripture*. 2. That I profeſs to perſwade *D.* to no other: And you cannot make me a Religion againſt my will.

CHAP. IV.

What is the Papiſts Religion?

R. I Have plainly told you what my own, and the Proteſtants Religion is, *viz. Nothing but Chriſtianity; contained integrally in the holy Scriptures; And the* eſſentials *being the* Baptiſmal Covenant, *explained in the Creed, Lords-prayer and Chriſtian Decalogue, are delivered to us both in the ſaid* Scriptures, *and by* diſtinct Tradition; *which alſo hath brought down to us the* Scripture it ſelf: *Not a Tradition depending on the pretended* Authority of the Roman Pope *or* party, *or on any other that ſhal pretend the like*: *But that* Hiſtorical evidence of matter of fact, which is ſurelier given us by all ſorts of Chriſtians, *taking in the Concord of many Hereticks, infidels and enemies; which* evidence *dependeth not on the credit of* ſupernatural Revelation, *but on the* natural credibility, *yea and* certainty *of ſuch* univerſal circumſtantiated concordant teſtimony; *and is neceſſarily antecedent to the Belief of* ſupernatural Revelations

velations in the particulars, *as* ſight *and* hearing *were in the auditors of Chriſt and the Apoſtles; ſeeing theſe two Acts of knowledge,* [Whatever God ſaith is True; *and* This God ſaith] *muſt neceſſarily go before our* Belief *or* Truſt *that* [This is true, becauſe God ſaith it.] *And ſo we run not in a circle, and need not a ſupernatural faith, for the founding of our firſt ſupernatural faith, that is, A firſt before the firſt.*

Without fraud or obſcurity this *is our* faith and Religion.

Now do you as honeſtly and plainly tell me, *What is yours*, which *D.* muſt be perſwaded too: For I confeſs, that I take it to be an unintelligible thing, and deſpair that ever you give any man a certain notice, what it is, which may be truly called the Religion of your Roman Catholick-Church.

P. I ſhal make you underſtand it if you are willing: But, 1. Note that *Religion* being a larger word then *Faith*, includeth alſo *Practiſe* or *Manners*, we muſt give you a diſtinct account of each: For they have not the ſame cauſes: Our *Faith is Divine*; But our *Manners* or *Practiſe* muſt follow the *Laws* of the *Church*, as well as the immediate Laws of of God: Theſe muſt not be confounded.

R. Man hath three faculties, *Intellective*, *Volitive* and Vitally-*Executive*, or *Active*: Our

Our *Religion ſubjectively* muſt be in all, *viz.* The Sanctity of all, by holy *Life*, *Light* and *Love*: And therefore the *Rule* which is our *objective Religion* doth extend to all, (to *Intellect*, *Will* and *Practiſe*.) And ſurely for *all*, there is a *rule directly Divine*, given by *inſpiration* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, or Chriſts own words, and *ſubordinate rules* by *Chriſts Miniſters*, which are directly *humane*, & no otherwiſe *Divine* then as God hath in general authorized them thereto. Even as the *Soveraign* hath the only *univerſal legiſlative power*, and *Magiſtrates by Him* are authorized to ſubordinate *mandates* and acts of government. And ſo we have a *Divine Faith* and *Revelation*, and a *ſubordinate humane faith* and miniſterial revelation or preaching: We have *Divine perſwaſions*, and *ſubordinate perſwaſions of men*: We have *Divine Laws*, yea and *executions*; and we have *humane ſubordinate Laws* and *executions*. If you reſolve to call the *humane*, *Divine*, ſo far as they are indeed *authorized* by God, I will not quarrel about words: But remember, 1. That ſo you muſt do alſo on the ſame reaſons, by the Laws of Kings, and the commands of Parents, who are as much authorized by God to their proper government. 2. And I hope you mean not to confound theſe *humane Laws*, with *Gods own univerſal Laws*, nor *humane faith* with *Divine faith*. And be it known to

you, It is the *Divine revelations* and *Laws as diſtinct from the humane*, which we are now calling our *Religion*, and diſputing of; though this Religion teach us to obey *Parents*, *Paſtors* and *Princes*, and that obedience may be conſequentially and reductively called *Religious*, if you pleaſe. But if really your Religion be not Divine, but humane, let us know it. For by the word Religion, we eſſentially mean that which is Divine.

P. Men were the ſpeakers and writers of the Scriptures, and ſo far they are humane, as well as the decrees of the preſent Church.

R. The Decalogue was written by God, and delivered by the Miniſtery of Angels: Chriſt was owned by a voice from Heaven. And himſelf ſpake and did moſt recited by the four Evangeliſts: And the Prophets and Apoſtles ſpake by the immediate infallible inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt: So that the Holy Ghoſt is the Author of the Scriptures. But the preſent Paſtors of the Church inſtead of that immediate revelation from God by the Spirits inſpiration, have but the ordinarie help of the Spirit, to underſtand thoſe ſame revelations, and that proportioned to the meaſure of their diligence, natural parts and helps of Art, as the knowledge of Theologie is attained by other Students; who are none of them perfect or free from error.

P. I will tell you what our Religion is, *It is Gods Word concerning things to be believed and done delivered partly in the Canonical Scriptures, and partly by Oral Tradition*, and *received by the Church, and by it delivered to us.* The *Trent. Catech. Prefac. q.* 12. ſaith, *Omnis doctrinæ ratio, quæ fidelibus tradenda ſit, verbo Dei continetur, quod in Scripturam, Traditioneſque diſtributum eſt.* The reaſon of every doctrine which is to be delivered to the faithful, is contained in the Word of God, which is diſtributed into the Scripture and Traditions.

Vide Concil. Senonenſ. in Bin. Decr. 5. p. 671. & Concil. Tridentini Seſſ 4 p. 802. *Perſpicienſque hanc Veritatem & diſciplinam contineri in libris ſacris, & ſine ſcripto Traditionibus, quæ ex ipſius Chriſti ore ab Apoſtolis accepta, & ab ipſis Apoſtolis Spiritu ſancto*

Q. Was it from the Church that the firſt Church received it? Or was it not the ſame Divine Religion which the firſt Church (whether Council or Practiſers) received without the Tradition of Council or Practiſers? If ſo, this cannot be eſſential to Religion. If the Apoſtles words were to be believed, their proved Writings are to be believed. And their Writings were proved theirs before a general Council or univerſal practiſe witneſſed it: Even by each Church and perſon that received any Epiſtle from any one of them.

dictante quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum patrum sententiam sequuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, nec non Traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Christo, vel à Spiritu sancto dictatas, & continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu & reverentia suscipit ac veneratur.

Bellarmin. de Verbo Dei, lib. 4. cap. 2, 3. sheweth the divers sorts of unwritten Traditions which are part of Gods Word: some *de fide*, as *the perpetual Virginity* of *Mary*, *that there are but four Gospels*, &c. and some of Manners; as *Crossing*, *Fast-days*, *&c. Easter*, *Whitsuntide*, and other Festivals.

Veron. de Reg. fid. cap. 2. saith, 'The total 'and only rule of the Catholick faith, to which 'all are obliged under pain of heresie and ex'communication, is *Divine revelation delive'red to the Prophets and Apostles*, proposed by 'the Catholick Church in her general Coun'cils, or by her universal practise, to be belie'ved as an Article of Catholick faith. All that 'is of this nature is an Article or doctrine of 'faith. And no other doctrine can be of 'faith, if either the first condition fail, *viz.* Di'vine revelation, or the second, which is a 'proposal by the universal Church *pag.* 5. No 'Doctrine grounded on Scripture *diversly*

'*inter-*

'*interpreted*, either by the ancient Fathers, or 'our modern Doctors, is an Article of faith. 'For such a Doctrine, though it may be re- 'vealed, yet the revelation is not ascertained 'to us, nor proposed 'by the Church, &c. 'Nor any proposition 'which can be proved 'only by conse- 'quence drawn from 'Scripture, though 'the consequences 'were certain and evident, and deduced from 'two propositions of Scripture, &c Yet these 'Doctrines are certain, when the premises are 'so. &c. *Gratians* decrees: the Papal decrees 'contained in the body of the Canon Law, 'none of them do constitute an Article of 'Faith, &c. Nor that which is defined in Pro- 'vincial Councils, though the Pope preside in 'person, &c. for the second condition is al- 'ways wanting in this case, and very often the 'first. &c *p.* 11. I did not say that such defi- 'nitions were not *of* '*faith*, &c but they 'are not of Catholick 'Faith. or which all as 'Catholicks are bound to hold as of Faith, and 'the contrary to which is heretical, and remo- 'veth from the bosome of the Church. *p.* 12.

So that if the Doctors will but differ in their Expositions, the Scripture is no more the sure Word of God, or to be believed by Catholick Faith.

Of the Pope without a general Council.

Mark then, that it may be *de fide divina*, though not of *Catholick neceſſity*, without the propoſal of Council or univerſal practiſe.

'13. The *Practiſe* even of the univerſal 'Church, is no ſufficient ground for an 'Article of Catholick 'faith, by reaſon the 'object of faith is *Truth*: and oftentimes the 'Church proceeds in matter of *practiſe*, upon '*probable Opinions*, and this probability is ſuffi-'cient to juſtifie the *practiſe*, which the Church 'on juſt cauſe may change; As *e.g.* as *Vaſquez* 'teacheth, the Church did anciently pray 'in the Maſs for infidels alive, and Catechu-'mens dead, and the Sacrifice of the Maſs was 'offered for them, and yet he rather inclineth 'to the contrary, that the Sacrifice of the 'Maſs ought not to be offered, but for the 'faithful living and dead, by which opinion 'the Church ſeemeth guided at preſent. But '*Vaſquez* anſwers, that the Church following 'a probable opinion, did practiſe that which 'ſhe did not declare to be of faith. *pag.* 15. So 'general Councils when they mention any 'thing in this manner (by way of ſimple aſſer-'tion) and do not properly *define*: For as '*Bellarmine* affirms, it is neceſſary that general 'Councils *properly define* the thing in queſtion, 'as a decree which ought to be held as of Ca-'tholick Faith. Hence *Bellarmine* adds, they 'are not properly Hereticks, who hold the

'Pope

'Pope not to be above all Councils, though 'he say the last *Laterane* Council under *Leo* 'the tenth, *Sess.* 11. Expresly and professedly 'teacheth that the Pope is above all Councils, 'and rejects the contrary Decree of the 'Council of *Basil:* because it is doubtful whether the *Laterane* Council defined that Doctrine properly, as a Decree to be *believed with Catholick faith.* The same *Bellarm. de Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 19. also requireth that the definition be made *Conciliarly:* Pope *Martin* the fifth said, he only confirmed those Decrees of faith which were made in the Council of *Constance*, *Conciliariter:* that is, after the manner of other Councils, the question being first diligently examined: But it's clear (saith he) that this Decree, that a general Council hath immediate authority from Christ, which all, even the Pope, are bound to obey, was made without any examining, *pag.* 17. The object defined must be truly and properly an object of faith; and a Decree ought to be on a thing universally proposed to the whole Church, &c. *Vasquez* holds: It is not at all erroneous to affirm that a general Council may err in precepts, and in particular Judgements, &c. and *pag.* 19. in framing Laws not necessary to salvation; or making superfluous Laws, &c. Without all doubt a general Council may

'err in a queſtion of fact: (which depends on 'teſtimony and information of men:) So the 'ſixth general Council condemned *Honorius* 'of Hereſie by falſe information, and miſun-'derſtanding his Epiſtles, *pag.* 20. The Pope, 'ſaith *Suarez*, to a particular action belonging 'to humane prudence, hath no infallible alli-'ſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, &c. As that ſuch 'or ſuch an excommunication is valid, or that 'ſuch or ſuch a Kingdom is diſpoſable by the Pope, for ſuch and ſuch cauſes. So far *Veron*, who is moſt favorable to you, in narrowing our faith.

R. Thus far you have reſolved me: but I muſt crave ſomewhat more. *Queſt.* I. Are there no eſſential conſtitutive parts of your Religion, more neceſſary then the *Integrals* & *Accidentals*? Have you no deſcription for it, but that *it is Divine Revelation propoſed by the Church*? The *Doctrine* of *Sacrificing* was a *Divine Revelation to Adam*, and the difference of *clean and unclean Beaſts to Noah*, and the Jewiſh Law was *Gods Revelation to Moſes* and them: And yet I ſuppoſe Chriſtianity is ſomewhat different from all theſe. Is not Chriſtianity your Religion? Hath Chriſtianity no conſtitutive ſpecial Eſſence, but only the *Genus of Divine Revelation*, which is common to that with all other *Divine Revelations*? And what if you add [*to a Prophet or Apoſtle*?]

Was

Was *Agabus* Prophesie of *Paul*, or *Pauls* of the event of the shipwrack, &c. essential to Christianity? Hath Christianity no *Essence*? Or is all Divine Revelation essential to it?

P. You take advantage of the disagreement of our Doctors. You know that some few acknowledge *distinct fundamentals*; and some deny the distinction in your sense: And most of us say, that no man can enumerate the things necessary to all, but that it dependeth upon mens various capacities, educations, and means of knowing. And in sum, that no more is necessary to all to be explicitly believed, but that *Gods Revelations are true*; and that *all are Gods Revelations which the Church proposeth as such.*

Johns. Nov. Rep. p. 19. of the explication of Terms: Know you not, that Divines are divided, what are the points necessary to be believed explicitely necessitate medii: *Some, and those the more ancient hold, that the explicite belief of God, of the whole Trinity of Christ, his Passion, Resurrection, &c. are necessary* necessitate medii: *Others among the recentiors, that no more then the belief of the Deity, and that he is the rewarder of our works, is absolutely necessary with that necessity, to be explicitely believed.*

You may take our judgement much from him that cometh neerest to you, whom I have heard

heard you much praiſe, as moſt moderate and judicious, *viz.* Dr. *H. Holden Anal. fid. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *Lect.* 2. *pag.* 53. 'Divines diſputing of 'the neceſſity of points to be believed, do 'commonly tend this way, to denote the Ar'ticles of things revealed, the explicite and 'expreſs belief whereof, is (as they opine) al'together neceſſary to all Chriſtians. The re'ſolution of which queſtion is among them ſo 'doubtful and uncertain, as that they are in 'this (as note, *they are in all things elſe*) diſ'cted and divided into various opinions: 'which they that care for them, may ſeek: 'To me they are as nothing, while the Au'thors of them profeſs, that they have no'thing of certainty. Yea, to one that medita'teth the matter in ſelf, laying by all preoccu'pation, it is moſt clearly manifeſt, that the 'Reſolution of this queſtion is not only un'profitable, that I ſay not pernicious, (as it is 'handled by Divines;) but alſo vain and im'poſsible. It is unprofitable, becauſe no good 'accrueth by it to ſouls. Note, It is pernici'ous, while Divines for the moſt part aſſert, 'that only one or two Articles; yea, (as ſome 'ſay) no ſingular Article at all, is neceſſary to 'be believed of all by an explicite faith. For 'hence (however the truth of the matter be) 'the colder Chriſtians taking occaſion, do lit'tle care to obtain that degree of knowledge

'in

'in the Myſteries of faith, which they might 'commodiouſly and eaſily attain. It is impoſ-'ſible, ſeeing it is manifeſt, that no particular 'rule or points to be believed, or number of 'Articles can in this matter be given or aſsig-'ned, which ſhal be wholly common and ne-'ceſſary to all Chriſtians: For this dependeth 'on every individual mans natural capacity, 'means of inſtruction, and all the other cir-'cumſtances of each mans life and diſpoſition, 'which are to each man ſo ſpecial, that we 'can determine of nothing at all that is com-'mon to all.

'But I handle the neceſſity of points to be 'believed in a far other ſenſe: For the Arti-'cles of the Chriſtian Faith, which I now call 'neceſſary, I do not at all underſtand to be 'ſuch as all & every one muſt diſtinctly know, 'or hold by explicite aſſent; But I mean only 'ſuch, the belief of which is accounted uni-'verſally by the whole Catholick Church, ſo 'ſubſtantial and eſſential, as that he that will 'deſervedly be eſteemed, and truly be a 'member of it, muſt 'needs adhere to 'them all at leaſt im-'plicitely and indi-'rectly: that is, by be-'lieving whatſoever 'the holy and univerſal Church doth Catho-'lickly

He doth better interpret the diſtinction of explicite and implicite on another occaſion, in another ſenſe.

'lickly believe, and teach as a revealed Do-
'ctrine and Article of Divine faith. And there-
'fore he is for that cause to be removed from
'its Communion and Society, who shal per-
'tinaciously and obstinately deny the least of
'them, much more if he maintain the contra-
'ry, while he knoweth and seeth that it is the
'universal sentence of that Church, that we
'must adhere to that as an Article of Faith.
'And in this sense, I will henceforth use the
'word *Necessity*.

R. This might have been said in fewer and plainer words, *viz.* That your Divines here-in do commonly err, and that perniciously, and yet that indeed he is of the same mind; *viz.* that it is impossible to name the Articles necessary to be believed explicitely of all, because each mans divers capacity, means and circumstances diversify them to each: But that only this one thing is explicitely to be believed, [That whatsoever the Holy and universal Church doth Catholickly believe and teach as a revealed Doctrine and Article of faith, is true.] And therefore that no man must pertinaciously deny any thing which he knoweth the Church so holdeth. So that nothing is necessarily to the believed actually and indeed, but Gods and the Churches veracity.

P. Another of ours that cometh as near you as most, openeth this more fully, *Daveno-*

port

port, alias *Fr. à Sancta Clara*, *De. Nat Grat.* pag 111. &c. 'As to the ignorance of those 'things that are of necessity of means or end, 'there is difference among the Doctors: For '*Soto* 4. *d.* 5. *q.* 5. & *l. de Nat. & Grat. cap.* 12. '& *Vega l.* 6. *c.* 20. *sup. Trid.* hold that now in 'the Law of Grace there is no more explicite 'faith required, then in the Law of Nature. 'Yea *Vega ib.* & *Gabriel* 2. *d.* 21. *q.* 2. *ar.* 3. '& 3. *d.* 21. *q.* 2. think that in the Law of Na'ture, and in Cases in the Law of Grace, 'some may be saved with only natural know'ledge, and that the habit of faith, is not re'quired. Whom *Horantius* terms men of great 'name, and will not accuse of heresy. I would 'this great mans modesty were more frequent 'with modern Doctors. Yea, *Alvarez de Aux. disp.* 56. with others, seemeth to hold, 'that to justification there is not at all requi'red the knowledge of a supernatural object '(or the supernatural knowledge of the ob'ject.) Others hold, That both to Grace and 'Glory is required an explicite belief of 'Christ. *Bonav.* 3. *d.* 25, *&c.* Others, that at 'least to salvation is an explicite belief of the 'Gospel or of Christ, though not to grace or 'justification. And this is common in the 'Schools, as *Ferera* shews that followeth it: 'And for this opinion *Scotus* is cited, &c. But 'I think he holdeth, that explicite belief of

'Christ

'Chriſt or the Goſpel, is not of neceſſity of 'means as to grace or glory, as 4. *d.* 3. *q.* 4. 'What is plainer then that now, men may be 'ſaved without the explicite belief of Chriſt. 'And I plainly think its *Scotus*'s and the com-'mon opinion, which *Vega* followeth, and '*Faber* 4 *d.* 3 and *Petigianu* very well, and 'of the Thomiſts *Bannes* 2. 2. *q* 2. *a.* 8. *Ca-'nus* and others: Yea, the *Trent* Council ſee-'meth to favor it, *Seſſ.* 6. *c.* 4 *p.* 114. So *Cordu-'ba*, *Medina*, *Bradwardine*. Note, *And ſuch* '(as have no explicite faith in Chriſt) *are not* '*formally without the Church*. This way go *Vi-'ctoria in* 4 *Relect.* 4. *tit.* *Richard de Villa Med.* '3. 25. *a.* 3. *q.* 1, *&c.*

'Well ſaith *Petigianu* 2. *d.* 35 *q.* 1. *a.* 9 that 'if there were a ſimple old woman to whom 'ſome falſe opinion were preached by a falſe 'Prophet (*e. g.* that the ſubſtance of bread 'remaineth with the body of Chriſt in the Sa-'crament) and ſhe believe it: Doth ſhe ſin by 'this? No. *pag.* 119. Yea, if ſhe ſo err 'through piety, thinking that the Church ſo 'believeth, perhaps ſhe ſhould merit. *p.* 120. 'For my part, I think that the vulgar commit-'ting themſelves to the inſtruction of the Pa-'ſtors, truſting of their knowledge and good-'neſs, if they be deceived, it will be taken for 'invincible ignorance, or at leaſt probable, (as '*Herera*) which excuſeth from faultineſs, &c.

'Yea,

'Yea, ſome Doctors give ſo much to the in-
'ſtruction of Paſtors, that have the care of the
'Sheep, that if they ſhould teach, that Note,
'*hic & nunc*, God would be hated, the rude
'Pariſhioner were bound to believe him:
'which yet I think falſe, *pag.* 123. It ſeemeth
'at this day to be the common judgement of
'the Schools and Divines, that the Laity er-
'ring with their Doctors or Paſtors are alto-
'ther excuſed from all fault; Note, Yea, oft
'times ſo materially erring do merit for the
'act of Chriſtian obedience which they owe
'their Paſtors: as you may ſee in *Valent. To.*
'3. *diſp.* 1. *q.* 2. *p.* 5. and others. So *Angles*
'2. *d.* 22. *q.* 2. *dub.* 7. *Vaſqu. pag.* 2. *diſp.* 121.
'In caſe they never doubted of the Veracity
'of their Prelates, &c.

Much more ſaith *Sancta Clara* there, to prove that the ignorant Proteſtants here may be ſaved; citing further to his end, *Zanchez in Decal. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *n.* 8. *Alph. à Caſtro, Sihman-ca, Argon, Tanner, Faber, Eman. Sa,* Rozel. And out of *Argon* tells us when Faith is ſuffi-ciently propoſed, *viz.* ['When faith is ſo con-
'firmed by reaſons, holineſs of life, the confu-
'tation of the contrary errors, and by ſome
'ſigns, as that Reaſon it ſelf beginneth pru-
'dently to preſcribe, that the matters of faith
'heard are to be believed, and the contrary
'Sect is falſe] *pag* 115.

'And

'And *probl.* 10. *p.* 127. Whether men may 'be blamelesly ignorant of the Law of Nature 'and the Decalogue? The common opinion 'is that they may; not of the first principles, 'but 1. Of the easy conclusions for some time, 'and of the remoter conclusions for a longer 'time: Such are the Commandments of the 'Decalogue as to the substance of the act; as 'in some lying, theft, fornication, manslaugh-'ter (in Will at least, &c.)

R. *Quest.* II. But do you think that men may not as invincibly and inculpably be unacquainted with the authority of the Pope and Roman Councils or Church, as you say they may be ignorant of Christ, and the Law of Nature? I instance in the millions of the *Abassine* Christians, who for above a thousand years never heard from the Pope, or his emissaries.

Holden l. 1. c 9. p. 169. *Quæret an teneatur quispiam ad internum Divinæ fidei actum, quam nec semper fortasse in ejus potestate situm novimus? Quamdiu sane arbitretur quispiam hujusmodi fidei actum lumini naturali & rationi oppositum & contrarium esse, nequaquam poterit ad illum eliciendum astringi.*

P. That cannot be denyed: For they have not the necessary means.

R. How then do you make your Churches proposal to be the necessary point to be *explicitely believed of all?*

P. We

P. We do not mean it of all that will be saved: For you hear that some may be saved without any explicite belief of Christ. But we mean it of all that *will* be in the Church, and be saved *there*.

R. But do you not hold and say, that out of the Church there is no salvation?

P. Some say so: and some say that it it *rare* out of the Church.

R. But are the *Ethiopian* Christians out of the Church?

P. They are out of the true Church, being Schismaticks.

R. Why said your Author before, that infidels were not *formally* out of the Church, who are invincibly ignorant?

P. But other Doctors are of another opinion.

R. But Christ is the Savior of his body: Are not those of the Church who are saved, or in a state of salvation? What hold you of that?

P. Some say, They are all of the Church: and others that Christ saveth more then his Church: And some say, that they are of the Church regenerate, but not of the Church congregate. But few own this, because it is your distinction: as of a visible and invisible Church.

R. Quest. III. But above all, I would know of you, what you mean by the *Catholick Church*

Church, whoſe propoſal is neceſſary to the being of faith?

P. We mean the Roman Catholick Church: that is, the *Pope and his Subjects*.

R. Do you mean the Pope without a general Council, or a general Council without the Pope? or only both agreeing and conjunct?

R. You take advantage of our differences: but thoſe do but ſhew, that this is no point of faith. Some hold that the Pope alone may ſerve: and ſome, that the Pope in a Provincial Council: and ſome that a general Council without him: But you heard *Veron* taketh in the Council, and it is no true Council without the Pope: And therefore the ſureſt opinion ſaith, that it muſt be both in Concord.

R. But what is the *univerſal Church*, whoſe practiſe is made ſufficient inſtead of, or without a general Council?

P. It is the whole Roman Church real, diſtinct from the repreſentative.

R. Is it the Clergy only, or the Laity only; or muſt it be both?

P. Both, but not equally; but in their ſeveral places.

R. Muſt it be *all* the Church, without any excepted? Or only the greater part?

P. Theſe are points not agreed of, and therefore not of faith. Some ſay that it muſt be

be ſo many as that the diſſenters be not conſiderable. But how many are conſiderable or inconſiderable is undetermined. Others ſay, It may be the minor part that practiſe, ſo be it the reſt do not contradict it, or do contrarily.

R. I will trouble you with no more ſuch queſtions, (though I have a multitude which ſhould be here reſolved) for I perceive that we muſt expect nothing but a Maze of uncertainties and confuſion.

We are next in order to *agree* upon our *common principles*, which muſt be *ſuppoſed* in our following diſpute: For they that *agree in nothing*, are uncapable of *diſputing of any thing*; ſeeing all concluſions of which we doubt, muſt be drawn from *more evident truths*, of which we are leſs doubtful, and reſolved into a conceded Principle.

PART

PART. II.

The Principles which Papiſts and Proteſtants are agreed in: And therein the full juſtification of all the Proteſtants Religion.

THe firſt common Principle: *That we are Men, having Reaſon, and Free-will, and Senſe; whoſe natural way of knowing things ſenſible, is by the perception of our ſenſes, having no way of greater certainty.*

R. I take it for a common principle, that we are *Men*, having *Reaſon*, and *Free-will*, and *Senſe*: whoſe natural way of knowing things ſenſible, is by the perception of our ſenſes: And therefore that our rightly conſtituted or ſound ſenſes, with their due *media*, about their proper objects are to be truſted; being either certain, or we have no certainty.

P. I know what you intend: I grant it as you expreſs it.

R. It muſt then be granted us, that there is *true Bread and Wine* in ſubſtance remaining, after the words of the Maſs-Prieſts conſecration.

P. Yes, when you can prove, that the conſecrated

ſecrated *Bread and Wine* are the proper objects of ſenſe: which we deny; they being not now *Bread and Wine*.

R. Is it by the *perception* of *ſenſe* that you deny it? or by other means?

P. No: It is by Faith and Reaſon, which are above Senſe.

R. Now you come to *deny* the *Principle* which you *granted*: *Senſe* is the perceiver of its *own objects*: No *Faith*, no *Reaſon* can perceive them, but *by ſenſe*: And if *due ſenſation perceive* them, and Faith deny them, then *Faith* denyeth *ſenſe* to be the proper natural *perceiver of its objects*, and our judgement of things *ſenſible* to be ſuch as muſt follow that perception. But we muſt diſpute of this anon, and will not now anticipate it. Only remember, that if you deny *ſenſe*, which is the firſt Principle, no mortal man is capable of diſputing with you, there being no lower principle to which we can have recourſe, and reſolve our differences.

The ſecond Principle: *That there is one only God, infinite in being, power, wiſdom and goodneſs; Our Owner, Ruler and chief Good; Moſt Holy, juſt and true, and therefore cannot lye; but is abſolutely to be believed, and truſted, and loved.*

R. I need not repeat it: do you not agree with us in this?

P. Yes: Heathens (that are ſober) and Chriſtians are agreed in it.

R. You grant then, that this may be known by them that are no ſubjects of the Pope. Remember anon that we are not to be blamed for believing God.

The third Principle: *That the whole frame of Nature within us and without us, within our reach, is the ſignal revelation of God and his Will to man; called Objectively, the Light and Law of Nature.*

R. I ſuppoſe that this alſo may paſs for a common granted Principle.

P. Yes, as you expreſs it: If we agree not of the Light and Law of Nature, we come ſhort of infidels, and meer natural men.

R. Obſerve then, that we are juſtified by your principles, for believing and truſting Gods *natural* Revelation. The very firſt part of which is made to our ſenſes. By *natural Evidence* God ſheweth us that Bread is bread.

P. Yes, when ſenſe is ſound, and objects and *media* juſt, and God doth not contradict ſenſe by ſupernatural Revelation.

The fourth Principle: *That natural* Revelation *is before ſupernatural, and ſenſe before faith,*

faith, and we are Men (in order of Nature at leaſt) before we are Chriſtians, and the former is ſtill preſuppoſed to the later.

R. This alſo I ſuppoſe is a granted Principle.

P. It is ſo: But ſee that you raiſe no falſe conſequents from it.

R. I conclude from it, that he that denyeth the perception of ſenſe to be the certain way of judging of things ſenſible, denyeth all the certainty of *faith*, & ſubverteth the very foundations of it: And that we are juſtified for our aſſenting firſt to Gods natural Revelations. It is God that made my *ſenſes and underſtanding*, and God that made the *object and media*, as *Bread and Wine*, and therefore *God deceiveth* me, if I be deceived in taking it for *Bread and Wine* after Conſecration. But God is to be *believed* in his *firſt Revelations*.

P. You vainly call Senſation, and Intellection or knowledge of things ſenſible by the name of *Believing*.

R. We will not vainly contend about the *Name*, if we agree of the *Thing*: But this leadeth me to another Principle.

The fifth Principle: *That the knowledge of things fully ſenſible hath more quieting, ſatisfying Evidence, then our Belief of ſupernatural Revelations alone, as made to us by a Prophet*

or Apoſtle: And that where all the ſound ſenſes of all men living do agree about their near and proper ſenſible object, there is the moſt ſatisfying Evidence of all.

R. I ſuppoſe that we are all agreed alſo in this principle.

P. As you *word* it we are: For our Divines diſtinguiſh of *evidence and certainty*: and are ſo far from ſaying that *Faith* hath more *Evidence* then *Senſe* and *Knowledge*, that it is ordinary with them to ſay, that this is the difference between *Faith* and *Knowledge*, and that *Faith* hath not *Evidence*: but yet it hath no leſs certainty.

R. Some men uſe *words* firſt to ſport themſelves out of their underſtandings, and then to uſe others to the ſame game. *Evidence* is nothing but the *perceptibility* or *cognoſcibility* of a thing: by which we call it *Knowable*; which is the immediate neceſſary qualification of an *object* of *knowledge*. *Certainty* is either *objective*, which is nothing but this ſame *cognoſcibility* or *evidence* as in a *ſatisfying* degree: Or it is *ſubjective* or *active*, which is nothing but the infallible or *true*, and *quieting ſatisfactory knowledge* of a *truth*. Where the *certainty* of *object* and *act* concurr: For no man can be certain of a lye or untruth: For to be *certain*, is to be certain that it is *true*: Thoſe therefore would befool

befool the World, who would perſwade men, that a clear and confident perception of an untruth, or confident error, is *certainty*. There may be objective *truth and certainty* of the *matter*, where there is not in us an active or ſubjective certain knowledge of it: But there can be no *active certainty* of an *objective uncertainty*, or *certain knowledge* of a *lye*. Now if you mean that *faith* hath *objective certainty*, without *evidence* or *certainty*, or as certaining *evidence*; that is, but to *ſay* and *unſay*: It hath *certainty* and no *certainty*: For this *certainty* and *evidence* is all one. But if you mean that *Faith hath an active ſubjective certainty*, without an *objective certainty* in the matter, you ſpeak an impoſſibility and contradiction: as if you ſaid, *I clearly ſee a thing inviſible or without light*.

P. Do you think that our Divines knew not what they ſaid, when they ſay that to believe without *evidence*, maketh *faith meritorious*?

R. The old aſſerters of this meant the ſame that Chriſt meant, when he ſaith to *Thomas*, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen*, and *yet have believed*. There is a *ſenſible evidence*, and an *intelligible evidence*. Faith hath not an *immediate ſenſible evidence*; that is, *we believe things unſeen*, and above ſenſe: And this is their meaning: We ſee not God, Chriſt, Heaven,

Angels, &c. But *faith* hath always *intelligible evidence* of *verity*; and as our Mr. R. *Hooker* ſaith, can go no further then it hath ſuch evidence.

However, I appeal to any that have not been diſputed out of their wits, whether, If God would give us as full a *ſight of Heaven* and *Hell*, and Angels, and bleſſed ſouls, as we have of the Bread and Wine before us, and as full a hearing of all that they ſay, in juſtification of holineſs, or lamentation of ſin, and as full ſenſible acquaintance with the World we go to, and our title to it, as we have with this world, I ſay, whether this would not be more aſcertaining and ſatisfactory to us, and baniſh all doubts, more then our preſent *faith* doth? I love not to hear men lie as for God, and talk and boaſt againſt their experience, as if the intereſt of faith required it. Things revealed to faith *are certain and infallible*. But that is becauſe we have *certain evidence*. 1. That *God cannot lie*; 2. And that *God revealed them*; and ſo that they *are true*. But if we did *ſee, feel, taſte, &c.* we ſhould be *more certain*. Elſe why is it ſaid, that we *now know but enigmatically*, and as *in a glaſs*, and as *children*; but hereafter *ſhall ſee as face to face, and know as we are known, when faith is done away*, as being more imperfect then intuition. We have evidence to prove, that the Revelation made

to

to *David*; *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Peter*, *Paul*, &c. were of God, and that their *words* are by us to be believed, &c. But to ſee, hear, taſte, feel, &c. would be a more *quieting aſſurance*.

Therefore when all *the ſound ſenſes of all men living*, perceive after conſecration, that there is *Bread and Wine*, this *certainty* is, 1. in order *antecedent to that of faith*, and 2. by *evidence*, *more ſatisfying* and aſſuring then that of *meer faith*, as to a Prophets Revelation; And therefore to reject it on pretence of *faith*, is a ſubverſion of all natural methods of aſſurance; and is but pretended, I think, by your ſelves.

The ſixth Principle: *That except thoſe immediate inſpirations, which none but the inſpired do immediately and clearly perceive, we have no* Revelations *from God, but by* ſigns; *which are* created beings; *and have their ſeveral* Natures, *and ſo may be called* Phyſical, *though ſignifying moral things. And thus far our natural and ſupernatural* Revelations *agree.*

R. Every being is either *uncreated*, which *is God only*, or created (in a large ſenſe, that is cauſed:) What God revealed to Chriſt, *Peter*, *Paul*, &c. we have knowledge of, but by ſigns: In Scripture theſe ſigns are words: Theſe words ſignify partly the mind of God, and the ſpeakers or writers, and partly the

matter ſpoken or written. When it is ſaid, that *it is impoſſible for God to lie*, it can mean nothing to us, but that it is impoſſible that God ſhould make us a deceitful ſign of his will. The voice of an Angel, Prophet, Apoſtle, a thouſand Miracles, &c. are but *ſigns* of the *matter* and of Gods *will*: And if God can ordinarily make falſe *natural ſigns*, we are left unaſſured that he cannot make falſe ſigns by an Angel, or a Prophet, or a Miracle. And ſo all faith is left uncertain.

P. Then you will make God a lyar or deceiver, whenever any man is deceived by natural ſigns.

R. Not ſo: For men may *deceive themſelves*, by taking thoſe for *ſigns* of a thing which are *none*, and ſo by *miſunderſtanding* them. And the Devil and bad men may promote this deceit. But whenever God giveth man ſo *plain a ſign* of the *matter* and his *will*, as that no error of an *unſound ſenſe*, an *unqualified object*, a *culpable* or diſeaſed *fantaſie* or *intellect*, interveneth, then if we are deceived, it can be none but God that doth deceive us; which cannot be, becauſe he *cannot lie*. And as it is an unreſiſtible argument againſt the Dominican doctrine of *Phyſical predetermination*, as abſolutely neceſſary *to all acts of natural or free agents*, that *if God phyſically predetermine every lyar to every lye, that is mentally conceived or uttered*, then

then we have no certainty, but he might do ſo by the Prophets and Apoſtles; ſo is it as good an argument againſt *Papiſts*, that if he *ordinarily deceive the ſenſes of all ſound men* by a falſe appearance of things ſeeming *ſenſible*, he may do ſo alſo by the *audible* or *legible* words of a Prophet.

The ſeventh Principle. *That he that will confute ſenſe, and prove that we ſhould not judge according to its perceptions, muſt prove it by ſome more certain evidence that contradicteth it.*

R. I ſuppoſe you will not queſtion this.

P. No: The *word* or Revelation of God is a more certain evidence.

R. How know you that there is any *word of God*, but by your ſenſes?

P. But yet by *ſenſe* I may get a *certainty*, which is above that of things ſenſible. As I know by the world that there is a God, by a certainty above that of ſenſe.

R. 1. If that were ſo, yet if things ſenſible be your *media*, you deſtroy your concluſion by denying them, and undermine your own foundation.

2. But it is not true: The knowledge of the concluſion can be no ſtronger then that of the principles, even of the weaker of them. If you are in any uncertainty whether there be

Sun, Moon, Heaven, Earth, Man, Beast, heat, cold, or any created sensible being, you must needs be in as much doubt whether there be a God that made them.

The eighth Principle. *That* believing *or* assenting, *is* intellection of the Truth of something revealed, *and therefore must have intelligible evidence of Truth in the thing believed.*

R. I know that *Affiance* or *Trust* as it is the act of the *Will*, reposing it self quietly on the believed fidelity of God, is not intellection. But the *assenting* act, is an *intellection* or an act of *knowledge* of a verity; not as *science* is narrowly confined to principles, but as *knowledge* is taken *in genere* for *notitia*. So to believe, is no other then to *know that this is true, because God saith it*, Joh. 6. 69. *We believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ*, &c. John 3. 2. *We know that thou art a Teacher come from God, for no man could do such works*, &c. John 21. 24. *We know that his Testimony is true*, &c. See Rom. 7. 14 & 8. 28. 2 Cor. 5. 1. *We know that if this earthly house*, &c. 1 Tim. 1. 8. 1 John 3. 2. John 8. 28. 32. 1 Cor. 15 58. *We know that our labor is not in vain*, &c. Therefore your denying the *certainty*, where the *evidence* is most notorious, and telling men of *Meriting*, if they will but believe your Church, without

out any *evidence* of certainty, is a meer cheat.

The ninth Principle. *That Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, and the Savior of the World, and that Chriſtianity is the true* Religion, *and Gods appointed ſufficient way to Heaven, including* Godlineſs, *which is its final part.*

R. By *Chriſtianity*, I mean both our *believing, loving and obeying Chriſt*, as the way to the Father, and our believing, loving and obeying God our Father, as the end of Chriſts Mediation: The *knowledge of God*, and the *Mediator* being *eternal life*, John 17 3. And as taking a man for my Phyſician, is taking him by his *medicines to help me to my health*, and ſo *health* is finally included, ſo taking Chriſt for my Savior, is to take him *by faith*, to be the means of bringing me to the *love of God* and to glory: And ſo I include *Godlineſs* and *Chriſtianity*, and the Law of Nature in the Law of Grace.

P. We are agreed on the truth of this: but not of the *medium*, by which it muſt be made known to us.

R. At the preſent I ask no more then that we agree in Chriſtianity, as the true and ſufficient Religion and way to life.

The tenth Principle. *That Baptizing is our Chriſtening: And that all that are truly Baptized are Chriſtians, and members of the viſible Church, untill they Apoſtatize or are juſtly excommunicate at leaſt.*

P. I grant you all this as a common Principle with Chriſtians.

R. Then you grant us, 1. That our Religion is the true Religion; of Gods appointment, ſufficient to ſalvation: For it is *Chriſtianity*, which you confeſſed to be ſuch. 2. You grant that we are baptized into the true Catholick Church, which is the body of Chriſt.

The eleventh Principle. *That all that are truly Baptized, have the pardon of all their ſins, and have preſent right to ſalvation, if they ſo dye.*

R. I mean, that they that are *internally true Conſenters* to the *baptiſmal Covenant*, and are *baptized*, have all theſe benefits of Baptiſm: And that *Infants* have them as *rightly dedicated to God* and *baptized*: Do not you conſent to this?

P. Yes, you know we do.

R. Then you fully grant, that all among the Proteſtants who in Infancy or at age are truly baptized, are in a ſtate of ſalvation: Why then

then would you make people believe that there is no ſalvation in our Churches, when you grant the right to all that are baptized.

P. But you are not baptized by lawful Miniſters,

R. Take heed what you ſay: Your party holdeth that even Schiſmaticks and Hereticks Baptiſm is valid, if they have all that is eſſential to baptizing in the doing of it: Yea, that a lay mans or womans baptizing is valid. If you deny it, I will ſhame you, by producing the common conſent of your Doctors; and your cenſure of *Cyprian*, and making the contrary doctrine to be a Hereſie.

P. But you have not all that is eſſential to baptiſm, becauſe you are not intentionally baptized, into the true Catholick Roman Church: For while you are not ſubject to the Pope, you are not baptized into the Church: and therefore *Bellarmine* ſheweth that indirectly we are obliged to the Pope by baptiſm; which you intend not.

R. Come, come, ſtrive not againſt your knowledge. 1. If our Baptiſm have not all that is eſſential, why do you never rebaptize Proteſtants when they turn to you? Do you not find that you condemn your ſelves? 2. Why do not you your ſelves put the name of the Pope into your words of baptiſm? 3. Doth your Tradition tell you that the ancient

cient Churches did baptize men into a subjection to the Pope? 4. Did any of the primitive Christians baptize men into the *name* or *subjection* of *Peter* or any Apostle? 5. Doth not *Paul* expresly renounce it as to himself and *Peter*, 1 Cor. 1. 12, 13, 14, 15. *Every one of you saith, I am of* Paul, *and I of* Apollo, *and I of* Cephas, *and I of Christ: Is Christ divided? Was* Paul *crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of* Paul? &c. 6. Did not Christ himself tell us all that was essential to baptism in his institution, *Matth.* 28. without making any mention of *Peter* or the Pope?

P. I cannot deny, but our Doctrine inferreth that all that are baptized among you have a true Sacrament, but not the benefit of it, and so are not in a state of pardon and salvation: Or at least when you come to age, by refusing the Pope, you turn hereticks and lose it.

R. I know some of your divided writers say that we have *Sacramentum*, but not *Rem Sacramenti*: But 1. You say that a Character is imprinted by baptism, and all sin done away, and the person in a state of life, unless he come *feignedly*; which you will not charge on Infants, nor can you prove it by those of the Anabaptists themselves, that are baptized at age. And saith *Aquinas* when the fiction ceaseth, the fruits of baptism are obtained. 2. And it will be long ere you will prove that

to

to be baptized into the name of the Trinity is uneffectual, if we leave out the Pope. 3. And you will hardly make a man underſtand, what you mean by the validity of the baptiſm of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, if it neither take the baptized into the true viſible Church, nor the inviſible, or a ſtate of ſaving grace.

And as to Infants, loſing it, as you ſay, at age by hereſie. 1. Will you ſave all the Anabaptiſts, that are baptized at age? If their baptiſm put them into a ſtate of ſalvation, and they continue juſt of the ſame faith and mind that they were baptized in, ſure that faith which put them in a ſtate of ſalvation, will keep them in it; or not be damning through defectiveneſs to morrow, which made them heirs of Heaven to day. But you cannot make your doctrines hang together. 2. And they that are baptized in Infancy, are baptized into the ſame faith which they continue in at age. The Miniſter intendeth no other: The Parents, Sponſors, &c. intend no other: And will that prove defective even to ſalvation after, which was ſaving then? 3. If baptiſm make us *Chriſtians*; and if *Chriſtianity* be the *true Religion*, ſufficient *in ſuo genere* to ſalvation, then we that continue in the *Chriſtianity* which we were baptized into, by your confeſſion, continue in the true *ſaving Religion*; And this is *all our Religion*.

P. It

P. It is not every one that owneth *Chriſtianity* that ſhal be ſaved: Hereticks own it in general, and yet contradict it by their hereſies.

R. It is every *one* that *truly owneth Chriſtianity* in *mind* and *will* that ſhal be ſaved: elſe Chriſtianity were not a ſaving ſufficient Religion: The queſtion is not whether *objective Chriſtianity* or *faith* be ſufficient to ſave him that *believeth not*, or is not *ſubjectively* a Chriſtian; nor whether the *Doctrine of faith* be ſufficient in *omni genere*: But whether it be a *ſufficient Doctrine*, or *objective faith*, *in ſuo genere*? If a *Heretick* deny any eſſential part of it, he *believeth not* that which he (really, underſtandingly and prevalently) *denyeth*. It is but the *name* of *Chriſtianity*, and not the *thing*, which he owneth, who diſowneth any of the *eſſence*. Our queſtion is now, whether our *profeſſed objective Faith* be *true and ſufficient*? When you come to prove us *heretical* denyers of any of its eſſence, we will give you a ſufficient anſwer.

The twelfth Principle. *That the eſſence of our Religion or Chriſtianity as active and ſaving, is* Faith that worketh by love: *Or ſuch a Belief in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as is accompanied with a true devoting of our ſelves to him, by love and willingneſs to obey his Laws,*

Laws, ſo far as we know them; in oppoſition to the temptations of the World, the fleſh and the Devil: And he that is truly ſuch ſhall be ſaved.

P. I grant that he that truly loveth God, ſhal be ſaved: But a Proteſtant cannot truly love God, becauſe he hath not true faith.

R. Do you not agree and confeſs then, that if any Proteſtants do truly love God, and are ſincerely willing to obey his will, and to know it that they may obey it, ſuch are of the true Religion and ſhal be ſaved, and that Popery which denyeth their ſalvation is falſe?

P. If your falſe ſuppoſition were true, theſe falſe conſequents would be true: But you are all deceived when you think that you ſincerely love God, and are willing to know and do his will.

R. 1. Let all Proteſtants note this firſt, that you grant that none, but note, *falſhearted hypocrites*, that are not what they profeſs to be, and *love not God*, nor *would obey him*, ſhould *turn Papiſts*.

2. And if a man *cannot know his own mind and will*, what he *loveth* and what he is *willing of*, no not about his *end* and *greateſt concernments*, how can he know when he *believeth aright*? Why do you trouble the World thus with your noiſe about believing the Propoſals of your Church, if a man *cannot know*

whether

whether he believe or not? Note, And he that cannot know what he willeth, chooseth or loveth, can no more know what he believeth. For the acts of the will are more plenary and easily perceived. And do all Papists know their own hearts or minds, but no *Protestants?* What would you expect but indignation and derision by such arguing as this, if you will go about the World and tell men. [*You, none of you know your own minds and wills, but we know them; You think you love God, and are willing to obey him; but you are all mistaken, it is not so with you: but you must believe our Pope and his Council, and then you may know your own minds and hearts.*] They that believe you on these rates, deserve the deceit of believing you, and punish themselves.

The thirteenth Principle: *That when Christ described all the essence of Christianity, by our believing in and being baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the Apostles and first Pastors of the Churches, instructed people to understand the meaning of these three Articles; And the ancient Creed called the Apostles, is the exposition of them, as to belief: And that this Creed was of old the symbol of the true faith, by which men were supposed sufficiently qualified for baptism, and distinguished from Hereticks: which after was enlarged*

enlarged by occasion of hereſies to the Nicene & Conſtantinopolitane Creed; To which that called Athanaſius's *was added as a fuller explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity: And he that believed all theſe, was taken for one of the true Chriſtian Religion, which was ſufficient* in ſuo genere *to ſalvation.*

P. All that was then neceſſary to be explicitely believed, *neceſſitate medii*, was expreſſed in the Creeds (if not more:) But not all that is now neceſſary when the Church hath propoſed more.

R. 1. Some of you ſay, no more is neceſſary *ut medium*, but to believe that *God is*, and that *he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him*: Others ſ[illegible] the chief Articles of the Creed alſo are [illegible]nly neceſſary: And in your diſcord, we lay no great weight on your opinions. 2. But is not *Chriſtianity* the ſame *thing now* as it was at the *beginning*? Is *Baptiſm altered*? Hath not a *Chriſtian* now the ſame *definition as then*? Are not *Chriſts promiſes* and the *conditions* the ſame? Shall not he that was a *Chriſtian* then, be ſaved if he were *now alive*? May not we be *Chriſtians*, and *ſaved* by the ſame *conſtitutive Cauſes* which made men *Chriſtians*, and *ſaved* them in the *primitive Churches*? Subvert not Chriſtianity, and confound not the Church, and cheat not poor ſouls, by labouring to hide the eſſence of Chriſtianity,

ſtianity, and ſuch plain important truths. You cannot deny our faith to be true, without condemning the ancient Church and Chriſtianity it ſelf: While we aloud profeſs that the Chriſtian faith explained in all the ancient Creeds, is the faith which we own, in its eſſentials explicated.

The fourteenth Principle. *That the Books which the Proteſtants commonly receive as Canonical Scriptures, are in the agreeing original Copies, as to the very words, and in true tranſlations as to the ſenſe, the moſt true infallible Word of God.*

R. I grant that where the Copies *diſagree* by various Readings, we are no more ſure that any of them is the Word of God, then we are ſure, that ſuch a Copy is righter then all that differ from it. But as long as the eſſence of Chriſtianity on which our ſalvation is laid, is in the *Covenant of Grace*, explained in *Credendis* in the *Creed*, and *in Petendis*, in the *Lords Prayer*, and *in Agendis* in the *Decalogue* as explained by *Chriſt*. And no one duty or material Doctrine of our Religion dependeth on the various Lections, but thoſe Texts that agree are ſufficient to eſtabliſh them all; yea, as *Franc. à Sancta Clara ſyſtem. fid.* profeſſeth, the ordinary *tranſlations* ſo agree, as that no *material point* of *Religion* doth

doth depend on any of *their differences*; It is as much as we affert, that the agreeing original Copies, and the ſound tranſlations, ſo far as they are ſuch, are the true infallible Word of God; the former both as to *words and ſenſe*, and the later as to *ſenſe alone*. Do you not grant this?

P. We grant the Scripture, as you ſay, to be Gods infallible word; But 1. You cannot *know it to be ſo*, becauſe you take it not on the Roman Churches authoritative Propoſal; 2. And you leave out part of it.

R. 1. Whether we can *know it*, ſhall be tryed in due place. 2. And whether we have all of it, or enough, is another queſtion, to be debated when you will. You grant us expreſly that which we now deſire; which is the infallible truth of our Canonical Scripture. And this is all our Religion, containing not only the eſſentials, but all the integrals, and accidentals needful to be recorded. So that *all the Proteſtants Religion is confeſſed to be infallibly True.*

And from hence further note, that in all our diſputes, you are obliged to be the defendants, as to Truth: For we deny the Truth of much of your Religion, but you deny not the truth of one word of ours: but only the *Plenitude* or *Sufficiency*.

P. The name of a Proteſtant was never known

known till *Luthers* time: And the occaſion of it was a particular Proteſtation of the *German* Princes, and not directly a proteſting againſt Popery.

R. It is not *Names* but *Religion* which we diſpute of. And it is that which each party *profeſſeth* to be *their* Religion. Therefore you muſt take *our Profeſſion*, or you change the *ſubject* of the diſpute. And we profeſs, that the *Law of Nature* (which no ſober man queſtioneth) and the *Scriptures*, are *all our Religion*. Therefore if you pleaſe, you ſhal ſuppoſe that the name *Proteſtant* were not now in the World: It doth not ſignifie our Religion. But we now uſe it to ſignifie our proteſting *againſt Popery*, or that we agree *in ſubſtance*, and in *rejecting Popery*, with thoſe that made that particular *Proteſtation* mentioned by you.

Names are oft given from *accidents*; as *Africanus*, *Germanicus*, *Britannicus*, &c. to ſeveral Roman Captains; when yet their *Humanity* was the ſame before they were ſo named.

P. Turks, Socinians, Quakers, &c. proteſt againſt Popery: It ſeems then they are *Proteſtants* too; and your companions.

R. 1. Thus ſome men ſtudy to deceive, by turning from the queſtion to another. Our queſtion, I tell you is, *Whether* the Religion *of the*

the Proteſtants be infallible? and not, *Whence is their name?* 2. But by a *Proteſtant* we mean only one that taketh the *Scripture for the rule*, and *Chriſtianity* for the *eſſence* of his Religion: Which no one doth that denyeth any eſſential part of it. If we do ſo, prove it, and you ſhal have our anſwer. How do you judge of any man among your ſelves, that taketh Gods Word propoſed by your Church for his Religion, and yet miſtaketh the Church in any point: As *Durandus* that thought the matter of bread continues, whom *Bellarmine* yet denyeth to be an Heretick? So is it with any among us that miſtake the ſenſe of Scripture in ſome ſuch point.

When a Name is put upon any perſon or party from a common accident, you may if you will, call all by that name which that accident agreeth too: And ſo *Papiſts* are called by ſome *Non-conformiſts* now in *England*; becauſe they conform not: But the World knoweth well enough that it is *Proteſtants*, which are commonly meant by that name, and not Papiſts, Quakers, Seekers, &c. though theſe *conform not*. And ſo you may ſay, if it pleaſe your ſelf, that Turks, Jews, Heathens, Socinians, Quakers, Ranters, are *Proteſtants*, becauſe they *Proteſt againſt*, or reject Popery: But the World knoweth who is meant by the Name, even *Chriſtians rejecting proper Popery*.

And

And for my part, I deal openly with you, I care not if the name *Proteſtant* were utterly caſt aſide; If any man be ſo deceived by it as 1. Either to think that it ſignifieth the Eſſence of our Religion (unleſs you mean as we proteſt for Chriſtianity.) 2. Or that we take thoſe called *Proteſtants* for the *whole Catholick Church*, they make it an occaſion of their own deceit: Names of diſtinction are uſed, becauſe men know not elſe readily how to ſpeak intelligibly of one another without circumlocutions: And then cometh the Sectarian, and taketh his Party, for *all the Church* (at leaſt which he may lawfully communicate with,) and the name of his party to notify *his Religion*. And then comes the crafty Papiſt, and pretends from hence that ſuch a named Religion is new; and asketh you, where was there any (e. g.) Proteſtants before *Luther*?

My Religion is *naked Chriſtianity*, the ſame as is where the name of a *Proteſtant* is *not known*, and as was *before it was known*; and as if the name of the *Pope* had never been known. But now the *Pope* and his *Monarchical Uſurpation* over all the World, *are riſen*, and *known*: I am one of thoſe that proteſt againſt them, as being againſt Chriſtianity which is my Religion; But ſo as to addict my ſelf to the opinions of no man or party that oppoſeth them, wholly

wholly and abſolutely and beyond evidence of truth: I take the *Reformed Churches*, to be the ſoundeſt in the World: But I take their Confeſſions to be all the imperfect expreſſions of men; and the Writings of Proteſtant Divines to be ſome more clear and ſound, and ſome more dark, empty, and leſs ſound, and in many things I differ from many of them. Chooſe now whether you will call me a Proteſtant or not; I tell you *my Religion*, which is *ſimple Chriſtianity*: Names are at your own Will. I could almoſt wiſh that there were no name known beſides that of *Chriſtian*, as notifying our Faith and Religion, in the Chriſtian World (though as notifying *Hereſie* and *ſin*, there muſt be proper names, as in *Rev.* the name *Nicolaitans* is uſed.) Even the word *Catholick*, had long a narrower ſenſe in the Empire, with many then I now own it in. Though as it ſignifieth *one that is of the Church univerſal*, loveth *univerſally* all *true Chriſtians*, & hath Communion with them in Faith, Love, and Hope, ſo I like it, and am *A Catholick Chriſtian*. I diſpute for nothing elſe; I perſwade this perſon here in doubt, to nothing elſe; but 1. To hold faſt to true and meer Chriſtianity; 2. To reject all in Popery, or any other Sect that is *evidently againſt it*; 3. To *ſuſpend* his belief of all *that's doubtful*, and to receive nothing as a part of *Divine*

faith

faith or *Religion*, till he *be sure* that indeed it is of God.

And now these Principles being supposed, let us proceed, and try whether Popery be of God or not.

PART. III.

The Protestants Reasons against Popery.

D. I Have heard what you have said in stating the *Protestants* Religion: I now expect to hear *what reasons you have against that which you call Popery*: And afterwards, that you prove all that you charge upon it. But I adjure you first, that you say nothing but what you believe in your conscience to be the truth, as one that looketh to be judged for it.

R. With many Papists confident and vehement protestations go instead of Arguments, and we oft hear them say, [*If this be not true, I am content to be torn in a thousand pieces: We will seal it with our blood: We will lay our salvation on it: And do you think we have not soule to save? &c.*] Which is much like, as if they would end all Controversies by *laying Wagers* that they are in the right, or by protesting that they are honester and credibler men then their Adversaries: And it is no more then a Quaker,

Quaker, or other such Sectary will say: the most proud and ignorant being usually the most confident: But yet though I expect not that you should receive any thing from me, upon *Protestations*, but upon *Proofs*, I will here promise you, that I will charge nothing on the Papists, but what in my Conscience I am verily perswaded to be true.

The Reasons which resolve me against *Popery* are these, and such like.

1. *Reason.* Their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is so *notoriously false* and *inhumane*, even contrary to the fullest ascertaining evidence that mankind can expect on earth, (*viz.* for all men on pain of damnation to believe, that there is *no Bread*, and *no Wine*, when all the soundest senses of any men in the World, do perceive Bread and Wine, by *seeing* it, *tasting* it, *feeling* it, *smelling* it, and by the *notorious effects*; and all this built upon *no revelation of God*, *no reason* at all, nor any true *consent* of the *Primitive Church*, but *clean contrary to them all*;) that I solemnly profess, that I find it an *utter impossibility* to believe it: And it often puts me to a doubt, Whether it be possible for any mortal man unfeignedly and fully to believe it? and whether there be *really any such Papist in the World*? or whether most do not for carnal respects take on them to believe it, when they do not? or rather the vulgar understand

their words, as not really excluding the true being of *Bread and Wine*; and the reſt only ſomewhat overawing their own reaſon, with a reverence of their Church, ſo far as not to *contradict*, or ſo far as *rationally* to own it, when they do not from the heart believe the thing.

So many contradictions, abſurdities, and impieties, are to be by them believed with it, that I am ſure no man that underſtandeth them, can poſſibly believe them all.

And all this muſt be done by *Miracles*, *ſtupendious miracles*, *daily* or *common miracles*, which *every Prieſt* can do at *his pleaſure*, and *never fail*, *ſober* or *drunken*, greater then raiſing a man from the dead; ſo that every beaſtly, ſordid, ignorant Prieſt, ſhal do more miracles by far, then ever Jeſus Chriſt did in all his life on earth, as far as we know by the holy Records, (if he live as long.) He that can believe all this, may next believe, that there is neither Earth under his feet, nor the Firmament over his head, nor Water, nor Air, nor any other Creature, and that he hath no *being* himſelf.

II. *Reaſon.* The Faith or Religion of the Papiſts, as deſcribed by themſelves, is ſo far from infallibility, as that it is utterly uncertain, unintelligible, and meer contradiction and confuſion; and a changeable thing, ſo that no

no man knoweth whether he have it or not, and whether he have it all; but however hath it, he hath certainly a hodge-podge of truth and falshood.

III. *Reason.* Their Papacy, which essentiateth their Church, is a horrid Usurpation of Christs own Prerogative, and of an Office to do that which is incomparably above the natural power or capacity of any mortal man; even to be the Apostle and Governor of the whole world (of Christians at least;) To take charge of all the souls on earth; to teach and call those that are uncalled, and to rule those that are baptized: even at the Antipodes, and in all those unknown or inaccessible parts of the World, which he hath no knowledge of: A far more arrogant undertaking, then to be the civil Monarch of all the earth; and utterly impossible for him to perform, and which never was performed by him.

IV. *Reason.* The said Papacy is an arrogant Usurpation of the power of all the Christian Princes and Pastors upon earth, or of a power over them, never given by Christ: It setteth up a Kingdom in a Kingdom, and taketh from Pastors the power which Christ gave them, over their particular flocks.

V. *Reason.* The said Papacy is a meer humane institution: They confess themselves, that it is not of Divine faith, that the Bishop of

Rome is St. *Peters* Succeſſor by Divine Right: It is no Article of their *own faith*: But Hiſtory fully aſſureth us, that it was but in the *Roman* Empire, that the *Roman* Biſhop was made Supream: as the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* is in *England*: And that he ſtandeth on the ſame *humane* foundation, as the *other four Patriarchs* of the Empire did. And that their *general Councils* were called by the *Emperors*, and were called *General* only with reſpect to that Empire. And there never was ſuch a thing as a *General Council* of *all* the *Chriſtian World*, nor ever can be: And that there never was ſuch, is moſt notorious yet by the Names ſubſcribed to all the Councils. But they abuſe the world, and claim that power *over all the Chriſtians on earth*, which *one Prince* gave his Subject-Prelates *in his Empire*: As if the *General Aſſembly* of *Scotland* or *France*, ſhould pretend to be a *General Council* of *the World*, and the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* ſhould call himſelf Archbiſhop of all the Church on Earth, and claim the government of it.

VI. *Reaſon.* The ſaid Papacy hold their claim of *Supream Government*, as by *Gods appointment* (though they confeſs as before ſaid, that it is not *de fide*, that the Pope ſucceedeth *Peter* by Divine right) and this notoriouſly, *contrary to the judgement and Tradition of the*

fir

far greateſt part of the Churches in the World: General Councils (ſuch as they had) and the ſenſe of the greateſt part of Chriſtians, have determined againſt the Papal claim. And *Tradition* condemneth them to this day, while they plead Tradition.

VII. *Reaſon.* It is Treaſon againſt Chriſt for the Papiſts who are but a *Sect*, and not the third part of the Chriſtians in the world, to call themſelves the *whole Church*, and unchurch all the reſt, and ſeek to rob Chriſt of the far greateſt part of his Kingdom, by denying them to be ſuch: As if they would deny two third parts of this Kingdom to be the Kings. They are Sectaries and Schiſmaticks by this arrogant dividing from all the reſt, and appropriating the name and priviledges of the Church to themſelves alone.

VIII. *Reaſon.* By making an *unlawful* and *impoſſible Condition*, and Center of *Church Union*, they are the *greateſt Schiſmaticks* in all the World; The greateſt *Dividers* of the Church upon pretence of *Unity:* As he would be a divider of this Kingdom, who would ſet up a *Vice-King* without the Kings authority, and ſay that none that ſubject not themſelves to him, ſhall be taken for Subjects of the King.

IX *Reaſon.* They ſtudiouſly brand themſelves with Satans mark of malice, or uncharitableneſs

bleneſs and cruelty to mens ſouls: while they ſentence to *damnation two third parts* of the Chriſtian world, becauſe they will not be the Subjects of their Pope: And they think their way to Heaven is ſafeſt, becauſe they are bolder then us in damning other Chriſtians: Whereas *Love* is the mark by which Chriſts Diſciples muſt be known to all.

X. *Reaſon.* They are inhumanely *cruel to mens bodies:* And this is their very Religion: For the Council at the *Laterane* under *Innocent* the third decreed, that thoſe that believe not, or deny Tranſubſtantiation are Hereticks, and all Temporal Lords ſhall exterminate them from their Dominions: That is, no man ſhall be ſuffered to live under any Chriſtian Lord, that will not renounce all his ſenſes, and profeſs that he believeth that they are all deceived by God himſelf; which is not only to renounce their *Humanity*, but their *Animality*, or ſenſe it ſelf. So that *no men indeed*, are to be ſuffered to live, but only ſuch as *deny themſelves to be men.* What Heathens, what Turks, did ever exerciſe ſuch inhumane fury? Beſides their burning and tormenting men as Hereticks, that will not do all this and more, and will not ſay as they require them.

XI. *Reaſon.* Their Church *indeed* is *inviſible*, while they deny it; and an unknown thing:

thing: For, 1. Men are forced into it by ſuch bloody Laws, as that they cannot rationally be known to be *Conſenters*: 2. And they have *no certain faith* to *conſtitute* a Church-member: For they hold that his obligation to believe, is according to his *inward and outward means*, of which no man can poſſibly judge: And ſo no man can know whether *himſelf* or *another* have *that faith*, which is required as neceſſary to ſalvation. And many of them ſay, That they *that believe not in Chriſt*, have *ſaving faith*, and *are in the Church*, if they had not ſufficient means.

XII. *Reaſon.* The Papacy doth intolerably tyrannize over Kings, and teach ſuch Doctrines of Perjury and Rebellion, as their very Religion, as is not in the practiſe of it to be endured in any Kingdom; nor dare they fully practiſe it: The Crowns and lives of Princes being at the mercy of the Pope; As the ſaid *Laterane* Council ſheweth.

XIII. *Reaſon.* Their *Church* is oft *eſſentially unholy, heretical and wicked.* becauſe the *Pope* is often ſo, who is an *eſſential part* of it: And therefore it is not the *holy Catholick Church.* General Councils have upon examination judged their Popes to be *Hereticks*, *Schiſmaticks*, *Adulterers*, *Murderers*, *Simoniſts*; yea, guilty of *blaſphemy* or *infidelity* it ſelf. And the *Church* cannot be

Holy, whose *essential part* is so unholy.

XIV. *Reason.* Their Churches *succession* is so notoriously *interrupted*, and their Papacy so often altered in its causes, as that it it become a confounded and a meer uncertain thing. So many notorious or judged Hereticks, Simonists, Murderers, Sodomites, Adulterers, have possessed the Seat, who were therefore *uncapable*, that the line of succession must needs be interrupted by them. And so many ways have they been made or elected, sometimes by the people, sometimes by the City-Presbyters, sometimes by Emperors, sometimes by Cardinals, sometimes by Councils, that if any *one way* of *Election* be necessary, they have lost their Papacy long ago. If *no one* way be necessary, then the Turk may make a Pope.

XV. *Reason.* Their Church called *One*, is really *two in specie*; *one* headed by a *Pope*, and *another* by a *General Council*: For while the *Head* or *Supream Ruler* is an *essential part*, and *one part* of the people own *one Head*, and another part own *another Head*, (as they do) the Churches thus constituted cannot be *one*.

And also *de individuo*, there have been long two or three Popes at once, and consequently two or three Churches: And to this day none knoweth which was the right.

XVI. *Reason.* They plead for a Church, which

which never had a being in the World; that is, *All Christians Headed by one Pope*; When *all the Christian World* did never take him for their Head, nor were governed by him to this day.

XVII. *Reason.* They dreadfully injure the *Holy Scriptures*, as if *Jesus Christ*, and all the *Prophets* and *Apostles* in all those Sacred Records, had not had *skill* or *will* to speak *intelligibly*, and *plainly* to deliver us the Doctrines necessary to salvation: But they make their *Voluminous Councils* more *intelligible* and *sufficient*; as if they had done better then Christ and his Apostles: And when men must only *discern Gods Laws*, and *judge Causes by the Law*, they make themselves *Judges of the Law it self*, that is, of God the Judge of all, and of that Law by which they must be judged.

XVIII. *Reason.* There is no other Sect of Christians under Heaven, which hath so many differences among themselves, or have written so many Books against one another as the Papists: And though many of them are of great importance; yea, some are about the very essence or constitutive Head of their Church, yet have they no handsomer way to palliate all by, then by saying that these are but *Opinions*, and no *Articles of faith*, and the infallible Judge *dare* not decide them: No

though it be diversity of *Expositions of Gods own Word*, yet Commentators still differ without any hope of a decision, as if *Gods Word* were not to be *believed*, but were only the matter of *uncertain Opinion*, till the Pope and Council have expounded it, and no more Scripture is *de fide* then they expound.

XIX. *Reason.* Perjury is made the very Character of their Church, or the brand by which it is stigmatized; As is visible, 1. In the *Trent Oath* imposed on their Clergy, which whoever taketh he is immediately perjured: and 2. By their disobliging men from oaths and vows; even the Subjects of Princes from their *Oaths of Allegiance*, whenever the Pope shal excommunicate them, and give their Dominions to others, as is decreed *Concil. Later. sub Innoc. 3. Can. 3.*

XX. *Reason.* They are guilty of *Idolatry* in their ordinary worship by the Mass: while they worship *Bread* as their *Lord God*: Nor will it justifie them to say, that if they thought it to be *Bread*, they would not worship it: Any more then it would justifie *Julian* to say, that he would not worship the *Sun*, if he thought not that it was *God*: And they confess, that if it prove to be still *Bread*, their worship will prove *Idolatry*: and we desire no other proof.

And I am not able to justifie their sending God

God his worſhip by a Croſs, Crucifix, or other *Image*, as a *medium cultum*, from being a groſs violation of the ſecond Commandment, (which they leave out.)

XXI. *Reaſon.* Their Religion greatly tendeth to *mortify Chriſtianity*, and turn it into a *dead image*, by deſtroying much of its life and power: 1. By *befriending ignorance*, and hiding the *holy Scripture*, forbidding all the people *read them in a known tongue* without a ſpecial licence: blaſpheming Gods Word, as if ſo read, it had more tendency or likelihood to *hurt* men then to *profit* them, to *damn* them then to *ſave* them; when they will ſay otherwiſe of all their own vulgar poſtils and ſuch like writings.

2. And by teaching the people a *blind devotion*, *viz.* to *pray* in an *unknown tongue*, and to worſhip God by *words not underſtood*.

3. And by making up a Religion much, if not *far moſt*, of *external formalities*, and a multitude of *ceremonies*, and the *opus operatum* of their various Sacraments; As if God delighted in ſuch actions as befit not the acceptance of a grave and ſober man; or as if *guilt* and *ſin* would be wiped off, and charmed away into vertue and holineſs, by ſuch corporal motions, ſhows and words.

XXII. *Reaſon.* Their Religion, though it thus tend to *gratify the ungodly*, by deceitful remedies

remedies and hopes, yet is very *uncomfortable* to the godly. For, 1. By it no man can know that he is a *true believer*, and not a child of hell, (much leſs that he ſhal be ſaved:) For they teach that no Divine can tell them what Articles are neceſſary to be believed to ſalvation: But they muſt be ſo many as are ſuited to every *ones capacity*, and *means*, during his life. And no man living can know, that he underſtandeth and believeth *as much* as his capacity and means were in their kind ſufficient to: Nay, there is no man that hath not been culpably ignorant of ſomewhat which he might have known.

2. Mens Sacramental receptions and comforts depend on the *Intention* of the *Prieſt*, which no man knoweth.

3. Almoſt all godly men muſt expect the *fire of Purgatory*: and conſequently none of them *can be rationally willing to dye*: Becauſe *this life* is better then *Purgatory*; and no man will deſire to go from hence into the fire: And ſo by making *all men unwilling to dye*, it deſtroyeth a *heavenly mind*, and killeth *faith*, and *hope*, and *love*, and *holy joy*, and tempteth men to be *worldlings*, and to love this life better then the next. Yea, it tempteth men to be afraid of Martyrdom, leſt (dying in venial ſins, as [illegible] do) they go to a Purgatory fire, more terrible then Martyrdom.

XXIII.

XXIII. *Reaſon.* Their Doctrine is not only contrary to many expreſs Texts of Holy Scripture, but alſo contrary to it ſelf: One Pope and one Council having decreed one thing, and another the clean contrary.

XXIV. *Reaſon.* All this evil is made more pernicious, by that profeſſed impenitence which is included in the conceit of their Churches infallibility: For they that hold themſelves infallible, do profeſs never to repent of any thing, in which they ſuppoſe themſelves to be ſo. And as repentance is the great evidence of the pardon of ſin; ſo *impenitency* is that mortal ſign of an unpardoned foul, without which no ſin doth qualifie the ſinner to be excommunicated by man, or damned by God: And a ſin *materially leſs, is more mortal unrepented* of, then a greater truly lamented and forſaken.

XXV. *Reaſon.* Every honeſt godly Proteſtant may be as ſure that Popery is falſe, as he is that he is himſelf ſincere, and loveth God, and is truly willing to obey him. And no man can turn Papiſt, without ſelf contradiction, who is a true Chriſtian, and an honeſt man: For by turning Papiſt, he confeſſeth himſelf to be before a falſe-hearted hypocrite, who neither loved God, nor ſincerely deſired to obey him, nor was true to his baptiſmal Covenant. For it is a part of Popery

to

to believe that none are in a ſtate of ſalvation, but the *Subjects of the Pope*, or members of the Papal Church: And conſequently that no others have true Faith, repentance or love to God: Or elſe that God is falſe in promiſing ſalvation, to all that have true Faith, repentance and love to God. All therefore that know their own hearts to be truly devoted to God, are ſafe from Popery; And ſeeing it is agreed on both ſides, that none can or ought to turn Papiſts but *ungodly hypocrites* (or Knaves) no wonder, if ſuch are deluded by the moſt palpable deceits, and forſaken of God whom they perfidiouſly forſook.

I will name you no more: If I make theſe, or any one of theſe good, as I undertake to prove them all; you will ſee that I refuſe not my ſelf to be a Papiſt without ſufficient cauſe.

And yet by this charge you will ſee that I am none of their extream adverſaries: I paſs by abundance of Doctrinal differences, wherein by many they are moſt deeply charged: Not as *juſtifying them* againſt all or moſt ſo charged on them, but 1. As giving you thoſe Reaſons which moſt *move my ſelf*, and which I am moſt able to make good, and leaving every one to his proper work: 2. And as one that have *certainly found out*, that in *many doctrinals* ſeeming to be the matter of

our

our wideſt difference, we are thought by many to differ much more then we do; 1. The difference lying moſt in *Words*, and *logical Notions*, and various ways of mens expreſſing their conceptions: 2. And the animoſity of men engaged in *Parties* and *Intereſts* againſt each other, cauſing moſt to take all in the worſt ſenſe, and to make each other ſeem far more erroneous then they are, and to turn *differing names* into *damnable hereſies*: And 3. Few men having *will* and *skill* to ſtate controverſies aright, and cut off miſtaken ſeeming differences: 4. And few having *honeſty* and *ſelf-denyal enough* to incurr the cenſure of the ignorant Zealots of their own party, by ſeeming but impartial and juſt to their adverſaries.

I mean in ſuch points, as 1. The Nature of Divine faith, Whether it be a perſwaſion that I am pardoned? &c. 2. Of certainty of ſalvation, 3. And certainty of perſeverance, 4. Of Sanctification, 5. Of Juſtification, 6. Of good works, 7. Of Merit, 8. Of Predeſtination, 9. Of Providence and the cauſe of ſin: 10. Of Free-will, 11. Of Grace, 12. Of Imputation of Righteouſneſs, 13. Of Univerſal Redemption, 14. Of original ſin, and divers others: In all which I cannot juſtifie them, but am ſure that the difference is made commonly to ſeem to be that which in deed

deed it is not: In the true impartial ſtating whereof *Lud. le Blanck*, hath begun to do the Chriſtian Churches moſt excellent ſervice, worthy our great thanks, and his bearing all the Cenſures of the ignorant.

PART IV.

The firſt Charge made good againſt Tranſubſtantiation: In which Popery is proved to be the ſhame of humane Nature, contrary to Senſe, Reaſon, Scripture *and* Tradition, *or the judgement of the ancient and preſent Church; deviſed by Satan to expoſe Chriſtianity to the ſcorn of Infidels.*

CHAP. I.

The firſt Reaſon to prove Tranſubſtantiation falſe.

R. THe Papiſts Belief of Tranſubſtantiation is, that there is a change made of *the whole ſubſtance of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt*, and *of the whole ſubſtance of Wine into his blood*. Their opinion (called their faith) hath two parts: The firſt is; that *there is no*

more

more true proper Bread and Wine, after the words of Conſecration, Hoc eſt Corpus meum. The ſecond is, that *there is the true proper Fleſh and Blood of* Jeſus Chriſt, *under the ſpecies* (as they call them) *of Bread and Wine*.

It is the firſt that I ſhal now prove falſe: And you muſt not forget the ſtate of the Queſtion, which is not, *Whether Chriſts Body and Blood be preſent?* But *whether there remain any Bread and Wine?*

Aquin. p. 3. q. 75. a. 5. ad 3. *Fides non eſt contra ſenſum, ſed eſt de eo ad quod ſenſus non attingit.* But doth not ſenſe ſay, Here is Bread and Wine?

Arg. I. If there remain *no Bread and Wine* after the Conſecration, then all the ſenſes of all the ſound men in the World are deceived, or all mens perception of theſe ſenſible things deceived, though there be due magnitude, ſite, diſtance of the object, a due abode, and a due *medium* and no depravation of the ſenſe or intellect. But this Conſequent is notoriouſly falſe, as ſhal be proved; Therefore Popery is falſe.

1. That *all mens ſenſes* perceive *Bread and Wine*, or *all mens intellects by their ſenſes*, will not be denyed. Not only *Proteſtants*, but *Greeks*, *Mahometans*, *Heathens*, *Papiſts*, all perſons perception by ſenſe is here the ſame: Therefore it is *ſound ſenſes*, or elſe there are *none ſound* in the World.

2. It

2. It is not *one sense*, but *all*. The *eye seeth* Bread and Wine: The *hand* and *mouth feel it*; The *palat tasteth it*; The *smelling sense smelleth* the Wine; yea, and the *ear heareth* it poured out.

3. It is *in due quantity*, and not an undiscernable *Atome*.

4. It is *near the sense*, and neither by too much distance or nearness made insensible.

5. It hath a *due abode*, and is not made insensible by *hastly passing by*.

6. The *air*, and *light*, and all *necessary media* of perception are present. So that there is nothing wanting to the *sensibility* of the object.

P. And how do you prove all or any of these? For ought you know, the *media* may be *undue*, the magnitude, site, distance, abode, may not be what they seem to be; and so you prove not what you say.

R. All that I am now saying is, that *all men of sound sense*, *in the World have these immediate clear perceptions*: The *Intellect by sense* perceiveth the object as *quantitative*, as *near*, &c. This you dare not deny: So that if this perception be false, and here be no Bread and Wine, then *Sense* or the *Intellect* discerning by the means of sense, is deceived.

P. I say that the *Senses* or *Intellects perception* are deceived.

R. I

R. I prove that they are not deceived; or at leaſt, that this *kind of perception* is the *moſt certain* that man on earth is capable of, and is to be *truſted* to by *all men*, and disbelieved or contradicted by none.

Reaſon I. Becauſe that *humane nature* is ſo formed, that the *Intellect* hath no other way of *perceiving things ſenſible*, but as they are firſt perceived by the *ſenſe*, and by it tranſmitted to the *Intellect* (or made its objects:) And if about *Spirits* it hold not, that *there is nothing in the Intellect, which was not firſt in the ſenſe*; yet about *things ſenſible*, it doth undenyably hold: And alſo that the *Intellect of it ſelf* is not *free* to perceive things ſenſible, otherwiſe then as they are *ſenſed*, or not to perceive them; but is *naturally neceſſitated* to perceive them. So that it is a contradiction for a man to be a man, conſiſting of a *reaſonable ſoul*, with *ſenſitive faculties* and a body, and yet not to be formed to judge of *things ſenſible* as *ſenſe perceiveth them*.

P. Then mad men ceaſe to be men, if they judge otherwiſe.

R. Mad men are your fitteſt preſidents: But, 1. I told you how mans nature is made by God to judge of things: I told you not that this nature may not be *vitiated*, and *hindered* from right action. Did I ever ſay, that the *eye* may not be *blinded*, or the underſtanding diſtracted?

ſtracted? Blind men and mad men judge not according to the tendency of *Nature*, and therefore *miſjudge*. The Connexion of the Intellect to the ſenſe is eſſential to man as man; but ſo is not the *ſoundneſs* or right exerciſe of his faculties.

Reaſon II. Hence I argue, that *ſenſation* and the *underſtandings perception thereby*, is the *firſt perception* of mans ſoul, and all that *follow* are but the *rational improvements of it*, and therefore ever *preſuppoſe* it: The natural order of the ſouls apprehenſions is this, beyond all controverſie. Firſt, *Senſe* perceiveth *things ſenſible*, and the *Imagination* the *images* of them. Next the *underſtanding* by a *ſimple perception* conceiveth of them, as it findeth them in the *imagination*. Thirdly, then by this *thinking* or *knowing*, we perceive alſo our *own Act*, that we do ſo *think* or *know*. And then fourthly, We *compound* our *conceptions*, and form *organical motions*, and ſpin out *concluſions* from what we firſt perceive. Now if the *firſt perceptions* be *uncertain* or *falſe*, it muſt needs follow, that all thoſe *following thoughts*, and *reaſonings* which do but *improve* them, are at leaſt *as uncertain* and *falſe*, if not more. So that there can be no more certainty in any of the *Concluſions* as ſuch, then there is in the *premiſes* and *principles*. Therefore if mans *firſt* and *moſt natural neceſſary* perceptions are *falſe*, all the following

following actions or reasonings of his mind must be no better. All being finally resolved into these *perceptions by sense*, there is no truth or certainty in mans mind at all, if there be none in these.

Reason III Else you would infer, that *God is not at all to be believed*, and that there is no such thing as *Divine Faith and Religion in certainty* in the World: And so you would bring in, by unavoidable consequence, far worse *impiety*, and *irreligiousness* then *Mahomet* or *Julian*, or any Idolaters that I hear of on the earth. For you directly will overthrow the *Divine Veracity*, or *Truth of Gods Revelations*, which is the *formal object of faith*, without which, it is *no Faith*.

P. A heavy charge, if you can make it good.

R. To make it good, do but first observe, 1. That *Gods essential will* or *mind* is not *in it self* immediately seen by man; but known only by some Revelation.

2. That this Revelation is nothing but some *Signs*: For there is nothing in the Universe of Beings, but *God* and *Creatures*, and the *Acts*, or works of Creatures. Now it is not *Gods own essence*, which is the *Revelation* in question. Therefore it must be either *a Creature* (or work of God,) or an *Act* or *Work* of a *Creature*. As the *voice* on *Mount Sinai*, and that of

of Christ at his baptism and transfiguration, and the written Tables of Stone, &c. were either the *works* of God immediately, and so created *Signs* of his mind; or else the *Acts* of *Angels*, and so *Imperate Signs* of his mind. Nor it is not the *ordinariness* or *extraordinariness* of the way of *making* these signs, which maketh them *currant* and *true*, or *credible*: For if God can make a *natural false sign*, he can make a *supernatural false* one, for ought any mortal man can prove. Only all the question is, Whether it *be indeed a sign of the mind and will of God or not?* Now the *works of Nature* are Gods *natural Signs*, and his *natural objective Light and Law*; as the perception of them is the *Subjective* or *Active Light and Law of Nature*: *Something* of God, these *natural signs* do signifie or reveal *plainly*, and *some things darkly*: And so it is with *supernatural signs*; As the *written Tables*, *the voice of an Angel*, the *words* of an *inspired Prophet or Apostle*, &c. Now there is no other way for God to speak or reveal falsly, could he do it, but 1. Either to make a *false sign*, naturally or supernaturally, or 2. To *determine mans sense* or *mind* to a false perception. And if God can do this naturally, why not supernaturally?

Nay, *à fortiore*, mark how you teach the Infidel to inferr? 1. Gods *Natural Revelations* are

are *Common*, and his *supernatural rare*. 2. Gods *natural Revelations* are moſt *certainly* his own *Acts*: But how far a *Voyce* or *Book* from a *Spirit*; may be the Act of that Spirit or Angel as a free Agent, and how far that Agent is fallible or defectible, we could not tell, if we had not farther evidence of Gods owning it. Therefore if you make Gods own ordinary natural Revelations or ſignifications to be falſe, how will you be able to diſprove the Infidel about the reſt? 3. And then note, that our Caſe is yet lower and plainer then all this: For if the very *Being* of the Creatures, which is the *Matter* of theſe *Signs* be uncertain to us, and all our ſenſes and minds deceived about it, then we have no place for enquiry, Whether this *Creature* be any ſign of the mind of God? As if the *hearing* of all men was deceived, that thought they heard that voyce, [*This is my beloved Son*] or *Pauls*, that thought he heard Chriſt ſpeak to him [*Saul, Saul, &c.*] or if their *Eyes* and *Intellects* were deceived, that thought they *ſaw Chriſt* and his *miracles*; or that think now that they read the Bible, and indeed there be no ſuch thing as a Bible, no ſuch words, *&c.* then there is no room to enquire what they *ſignifie*: For *nothing* hath *no ſignification*. *Truth* and *Goodneſs*, are *affections* or modes of being: And if we cannot by all our *ſound ſenſes* know the *being of things*, we

can

can much leſs know that they are *true or good*. Therefore all knowledge, and all faith, and all Religion is overthrown by your denyal of the truth of our Senſes, and Intellects perception of things ſenſible.

Reaſon IV. And by this means you are not *capable of being diſputed with*, nor any controverſie between you and any others in the World, of being decided, while you deny ſenſe. For then you agree not with mankind in *any one common principle*. And they that agree in nothing, can diſpute of nothing. For this is the firſt principle: *Eſt vel non eſt*, is firſt to be agreed on, before we can diſpute any farther of a *ſubſtance*. What will you do to confute an adverſary, but drive him to deny a certain principle? And can you drive him to deny a *lower fundamental* Principle, then the *Being* of a *ſubſtance perceived by ſenſe*, yea, by *all the ſound ſenſes of all men in the World*?

Reaſon V. Yea, it is ſpecially to be noted, that our difference is not only about the *ſpecies* of a ſenſible ſubſtance, but about the very *ſubſtance it ſelf in genere*, Whether all our ſenſes perceive *any ſubſtance at all*, or not? Suppoſe the queſtion were, Whether it be *water* or not, which all mens ſenſes ſee in Rivers? If a Papiſt would deny it to be water, doubtleſs, he denyed the agreeing judgement of all

mens

mens Intellect by ſenſe. But if he ſhould alſo ſay, *It is no ſubſtance*, which we call *Water* or *Earth*, This were to deny the *firſt Principle*, and moſt fundamental perception in nature.

Now that *this* is *your caſe*, is undenyable. For, 1. You profeſs, that *Chriſts Body* and *Blood* are not *ſenſible* there; That it is not the *quantity, ſhape, number, color, ſmell, weight, &c.* of Chriſts *Body* and *Blood* which we perceive, and that theſe Accidents are not the Accidents of Chriſt. 2. And you believe that the *Bread* and *Wine* is gone, that is, changed into the Body and Blood of Chriſt; ſo that no part of their ſubſtance, matter or form is left. And you put no *third* ſubſtance under theſe *Accidents* in the ſtead. So that you maintain, that it is the *quantity of nothing*, the *figure of nothing*, the *colour*, the *weight*, the *ſituation*, the *ſmell*, the *number*, *&c.* of *nothing*, which all mens Intellects by ſenſe perceive. So that the Controverſie is, *Whether it be any ſubſtance at all which by thoſe accidents we perceive?* And when we ſee, handle, taſte, ſmell it, you believe (or ſay you believe) that it is *none*; neither *Bread* or *Wine*, or any other: Now if by ſenſe we cannot be ſure of the *very being of a ſubſtance*, we can be ſure of nothing in the World.

Reaſon VI. Yea, it is to be noted, that

 though

though *Brutes* have *no Intellects*, yet their *Senſe* and *Imagination* herein wholly *agreeth* with the *common perception of man*: A Dog or a Mouſe will eat the bread as *common bread*, and a Swine will drink the Wine as *common Wine*: and therefore have the ſame perception of it, as of common bread and wine; And ſo *their ſenſes* muſt be all *deceived* as well as *mans*. And Brutes have as accurate perfect ſenſes as men have, and ſome much more. And meer *natural operations*, are more *certain* and *conſtant* (as we ſee by the Worlds experience) then meer *Reaſon* and *Argumentation*. Birds and Beaſts are conſtant in their perceptions and courſe of action; being not left to the power of *Mutable free-will*.

Reaſon VII. You hereby quite overthrow your own foundation, which is fetcht from *the Concord of all your party*, which you call *all the Church*: You think that a *General Council* could not agree to any thing as an Article of Faith, if it were *not ſuch*; (when it is but the *major Vote* that agree;) You ſay that *Tradition* is *infallible*, becauſe all the Church agreeth in it, (when it is perhaps but your Sect, which is a *minor part*.) But do you not overthrow all this, when *you* profeſs, that *all the ſenſes of all the ſound men in the World*, and all the *ſimple perceptions of their Intellects by ſenſe*, do *agree*, that there is *ſubſtance*; yea, *de ſpecie Bread* and *Wine* after

after the Conſecration? No *one mans* perception by ſenſe *diſagreed in this*, from the inſtitution of the Sacrament to this day, that can be proved, or the leaſt probability of it given. And if *this concord* be no proof, much leſs is *yours*: For, 1. The Intellect in *Reaſoning* is more fallible then in its *immediate perception of things ſenſed* (or perceived by ſenſe.) 2. Yours is but the conſent of *ſome men*; but ours is the conſent of *all mankind*. *Yours* among your ſelves hath oft in Councils a *minor part* of *diſſenters*, who muſt be overvoted by the reſt: But our Caſe hath *never one diſſenting ſenſe* or *perception*.

Reaſon VIII. By this denyal of *ſenſe*, you overthrow the foundations of *humane Converſe*: How can men make any *ſure Contracts*, or perform any *duty* on a ſure ground, if the *Concordant ſenſes* of all the World be falſe? Parents cannot be ſure which are their own Children; nor Children which are their own Parents: Husbands cannot certainly know their own Wives from their neighbours. No ſubjects can certainly know their own Prince. No man can be ſure, whether he buy or ſell, receive money or pay it, &c. No man can be ſure that there is a Pope, or Prieſt, or man in the world.

Reaſon IX. You ſeem to me to *blaſpheme God*, and to make him the *greateſt Deceiver of*

mankind, even in his holy Worſhip: Whereas *God cannot lye*; It is impoſſible: And the *Devil is the father of lyes*: And you make God to tell all the World (as plainly as if words told them) even by demonſtration to their *ſight*, *ſmell*, *feeling*, *taſte*, that, *here is Bread and Wine*, when there is none; yea, that it is at leaſt ſome *ſubſtance* which they perceive, when it is none at all.

Reaſon X. You thus fain God to be cruel to Mankind, and that under *pretence of grace*; Even to put ſuch *hard conditions of ſalvation* on man, which ſeem to us impoſſible, to any but mad men, or thoſe who by faction have caſt their minds into a dream. If theſe be *Gods Conditions*, that no man ſhal be *ſaved*, that doth not believe that all his ſenſes, and all the ſenſes of all the world, are deceived when they perceive *Bread and Wine*, or *ſubſtance*, many may take on them to believe it; but few will believe it, and be ſaved indeed.

Reaſon XI. Hereby you make the Goſpel or new Covenant to be far harder and more rigorous then either the *Law of Moſes*, or the *Law of Innocency*: For neither of theſe did damn men for believing the *agreeing ſenſes of all mankind*: *Perfect Obedience*, to a perfect nature, was fit to be a delight. The burdenſome Ceremonies had no ſuch *Impoſſibilities* in them. None of them obliged men to renounce

nounce all their ſenſes, and to come to Heaven by ſo hard a way.

Reaſon XII. You ſeem to me to *Contradict Gods Law and terms of life*, and to forge the *clean contrary* as his: He ſaith, *He that cometh to God muſt believe that God is*, &c. and *He that believeth ſhal be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhal be damned*: But you ſeem to me to ſay in plain effect, [*He that believeth Gods natural Revelations to all mens ſenſes ſhal be damned*, and *that believeth that the ſaid Revelations are falſe, may be ſaved*, cæteris paribus.]

Reaſon XIII. And what a thing by this do you make *Gods grace* to be? Whereas true *Grace* is the Repairer and *perfecter of Nature*, you make it to be the *Deſtroyer and Deceiver* of Nature. The uſe of Grace according to your Faith, is to cauſe men to believe that *Gods natural Revelations are falſe*, and that all the ſenſes of the World in this matter are deceived: Whereas a *mad man* can believe this *without Grace*.

Reaſon XIV. By this doctrine you abominably corrupt the Church with *hypocriſie*, while all that will have Communion with you, muſt be forced to profeſs that all mens ſenſes are thus deceived: And can you think that really they can all believe it? or rather your Church muſt be moſtly made up of

groſs hypocrites, who falſly take on them to believe it when they do not.

Reaſon XV. And by this means you make the Unity of the Church to become a *meer impoſſibility*: For your *condition* of *union* is, that *men all believe this among other Articles of your faith*: And that man hath loſt or vitiated his humanity, who can believe and expect, that *all Chriſtians in the World ſhould ever believe that all the ſenſes of all the World are thus deceived*. You might as well ſay, The Church ſhal never have Unity, till all Chriſtians do believe that *David* or *Chriſt* was a *Worm* and no *man*, a *door*, a *Vine*, a *Thief*, a *Rock*, in proper ſenſe; or, we ſhal have no unity till we renounce both our *humanity* and *animality*, and the *Light and Law* of God in *Nature*. And after this to cry up *Unity*, and cry down *Schiſm*, what *abominable hypocriſie* is it?

Reaſon XVI. And by this doctrine what *bloody inhumanity* is become the brand or Character of your Church? When you decree *Concil. Later. ſub Innoc.* 3. *Can.* 3. that all that will *not thus renounce their ſenſes*, *and give the lie to Gods natural revelations*, ſhall be *excommunicated* and *utterly undone* in this World, even baniſhed from all that they have, and from the Land of their Nativity; Yea, your Inquiſition muſt torture and burn them, and your Writ *de hereticis comburendis*, muſt be

iſſued

iſſued out againſt them, to fry them to death in flames, if they will not renounce the common ſenſes of mankind.

Reaſon XVII. And it even amazeth me to think, what horrid Tyrants you would thus make *all Chriſtian Princes!* When the ſaid Canon determineth that they ſhal be *firſt Excommunicate*, and then caſt *out of their Dominions*, which ſhal be given to others, and their ſubjects abſolved from their allegiance and fidelity, except they will exterminate all theſe as hereticks from their Dominions, who will not give the lye to all mens ſenſes and to Gods natural Revelations. The plain Engliſh is, Note. *He ſhal not be the Lord of his own Dominions, who will have men to be his ſubjects*, or ſuch as will not *renounce both their humanity and animality or ſenſe*. For to perceive ſubſtances, *in genere & in ſpecie* by *ſenſe*, and to *believe or truſt the common ſenſes* of all the World about things ſenſible, as being the ſureſt way that we have of perception, is as *neceſſary to a Man as ratiocination* is. Chooſe then, O ye Princes of the Earth, whether you will be Papiſts, and whether you will have *no men to be your Subjects, even none that believe the ſenſes of themſelves, and all the World.*

Reaſon XVIII. Thus alſo your Idolatry exceedeth in abſurdity, the Idolatry of all the Heathens elſe in the World: Even *Canibals*

and the moſt barbarous Nations upon Earth. For if they call men to worſhip an Image, the Sun, the Moon, an Ox, or an Onion (of which the Egyptians are accuſed) they do but ſay that ſome *ſpiritual* or *celeſtial numen* affixeth his *operative preſence* to this Creature: But they never make men ſwear that there is no *Image*, or *Sun*, or *Moon*, or *Ox*, or *Onion* left, but that the *whole ſubſtance* of it is turned into God, or ſomewhat elſe. Your abſurdities tend to make the groſſeſt Idolatry ſeem comparatively to yours, a very fair and tolerable error.

Reaſon XIX. By theſe means you expoſe *Chriſtianity* to the ſcorn of *humane nature*, and all the World. You teach Heathens, Mahometans and other Infidels to deride Chriſt, as we do *Mahomet*; and to ſay that a Chriſtian maketh and eateth his God, and his faith is a *Believing that Gods ſupernatural Revelations are a lie*, & that God *is like the Devil the great deceiver of the World*. Wo be to the world becauſe of offences, and wo be to him by whom offence cometh.

Reaſon XX. Laſtly, by this means you are the grand pernicious hinderers of the Converſion of the Heathen and infidel world: For you do as it were proclaim to them; *Never turn Chriſtians, till you will believe that Gods natural Revelations are falſe, and that all mens ſenſes in the World are deceived, in judging that there*

is

is Bread, Wine, or Sensible Substance after the words of Consecration.

These are the mischievous Consequents of your Doctrine. But one benefit, I confess, doth come by occation of it; that it is easier hereby to believe that there are Devils, when we see how they can deceive men: and to believe the evil of sin, when we see how it maketh men mad; and to believe that there is a Hell, when we see such a Hell already on Earth, as learned pompous Clergie men, that have studied to attain this malignant madness to decree to fry men in the flames, and damn them to Hell, and give them no peace or quietness in the World, unless they will say, that Gods natural Revelations are false, and that all mens senses are herein deceived by God, as the great deceiver of the World.

CHAP. II.

The Papists Answers to all this confuted.

P. IT is easie to make any cause seem odious, till the accusations are answered, which I shall confidently do in the present case.

I. All this is but argument from sense: And sense must vail to faith: Gods Word must be believed before our senses.

R. It is easie to cheat fools and children

into a dream, with a ſound of empty words: To talk of ſenſes vailing to faith, and ſuch like canting, and inſignificant words, may ſerve turn with that ſort of men. But ſober men will tell you that ſenſe is in exerciſe in order of Nature, at leaſt before Reaſon or faith, and that we are Men and Animals before we are Chriſtians: And that the truth and certainty of faith, preſuppoſeth the truth and certainty of ſenſe. Tell me elſe, if ſenſe be falſe, how you know that there is a Man, or Pope, or Prieſt in the world? that there is a Book or Voice, or any being? And what poſſibility then have you of Believing?

P. Gods Revelation is ſurer then our ſenſes?

R. This is the old ſong over and over. Revelation without ſenſe (to you and ordinary Chriſtians at leaſt) is a contradiction. How know you that God hath any revelations? If by preachers words, How know you that there is a preacher, or a word, but by ſenſe? If by books, How know you that there is a book, but by ſenſe?

P. II. We may truſt ſenſe in all other things, where God doth not contradict it: But not in this one Caſe, becauſe God forbiddeth us.

R. Say ſo of your Church too, your Pope, Council or Traditions; that we may truſt them in all caſes, ſave one or two, in which it is

is certain that they do lye! And will not any man conclude, that he that can lye in one caſe, can lye in more? If one Text of Gods Word were falſe, and you would ſay, You may believe all the reſt ſave that, how will you ever prove it? For the formal object of faith is gone, which is the *Divine Veracity*: He that can lye once, can lye twice. So if all our ſenſes be falſe in this inſtance, how ſhal we know that they are ever true?

P. You may know it, becauſe God ſaith it.

R. 1. Where doth God ſay it? 2. How ſhal I be ſure that he ſaith it? If you ſay, that it is written in Scripture; beſides, that there is no ſuch word; How ſhall I know that all mens ſenſes are not deceived in thinking that there is a Scripture, or ſuch a word in it? If you ſay that the Council ſaith it, How ſhal I know that there is a man, or ever was a Council, or a Book in the World? The certainty of Concluſions preſuppoſeth the certainty of premiſes and principles: And the certainty of faith and reaſoning, preſuppoſeth the certainty of ſenſe: And if you deny this, you deny all, and in vain plead for the reſt.

P. I muſt believe my ſenſes, where I have no reaſon to disbelieve them. But when God contradicteth them, I have reaſon to disbelieve them.

R. 1.

R. 1. You vainly ſuppoſe without proof that God contradicteth them. So you may ſay, I may or muſt believe the Scripture or an Apoſtle, Prophet or Miracle, except God contradict them. But if God contradict them, he contradicteth his own word or revelation: For we have no other from him, but by man: And if he contradict himſelf, or his own word, how can I believe him, or know which of his words it is that's true, when one is falſe? ſo here: His *natural revelation* is his *firſt*, *neareſt*, and moſt *ſatisfactory revelation*: And if that be ſaid to be falſe by his *ſupernatural revelation*, which ſhall I believe, and why?

P. III. You cannot deny but God *can* deceive our ſenſes. And therefore if he can, will you conclude againſt all faith if once he do it?

R. 1. This is not once; but as oft as God is worſhipped in your Maſs and our Sacrament.

2. God can deceive us without a lye, but not by a lye. Chriſt deceived the two Diſciples, *Luke* 24. by carrying it, as if he would have gone further; but not by ſaying that he would go further. God can do that from which he knoweth that man will take occaſion of deceit. God can blind a mans eyes, or deſtroy or corrupt his other ſenſes, he can preſent

an

an object defectively, with unmeet mediums, distance, site, &c. In this case he doth not give us a *False sign*; nor doth he by the Nature of the Revelation oblige any man to believe it: Yea, *Nature* saith, that a man is not to judge by a *vitiated sense*, or an *unmeet medium*, or a *too distant object*, or where the due qualification of the sense or object are wanting: *Nature* there tells us, that we are there to suppose or suspect that we are uncapable of certainty: But *Nature obligeth* us to believe *sound senses* about *duly qualified objects*; and to take *sense* for *sound*, when all the *senses* of all the *men in the World agree*; and the object to be a duly qualified object of sense, when all mens senses in the World so perceive it. For we have no way but by sense to know what is an object of sense.

3. The question is not what God *can* do by his power, if he will; but what God will do, and can will to do, in consistency with his perfection, and just and merciful government of the World. And God in making us Men, whose intellects are naturally to perceive things sensible, by the means of the perception of sense, doth naturally oblige man and necessitate him also, to trust his senses in such perception. And in Nature man hath no surer way of apprehension: Therefore if you could prove that sense is ordinarily fallible, and Gods

revela-

revelations to it falſe, yet man were not only allowed, but neceſſitated to uſe and truſt it, as having no better ſurer way of apprehenſion: As among many knaves or lyars, I muſt moſt truſt the honeſteſt & moſt truſty, when I have no better to truſt. If I am not ſure, that it is a *Sun* or *Light* that I ſee, yet I am ſure that I muſt take my perception of it as a *Sun* or *light* as it is; For God hath given me no better. If I am not ſure that my ſight, feeling, taſte, &c. are infallible; yet I am ſure, that I am made of God to uſe them; and that I have no better ſenſes, nor a better way to be certain of their proper objects: ſo that I muſt take and truſt them as they are, or ceaſe to be a man.

P. IV. Chriſts Body and Blood are not ſenſible objects; and therefore ſenſe is no proper judge whether they be preſent.

R. This is one of your groſs kind of cheats, to change the queſtion. We are not yet come to the queſtion, *Whether Chriſts Body and Blood be here?* And I grant you, that *ſenſe is no judge* of that, any more then whether an Angel be here. But the queſtion is now only, Whether *Bread or Wine*, or *ſenſible ſubſtance* be here? And of this we have no natural way but by ſenſe to judge.

P. V. If God ſhould ſay to you [*Your ſenſes are in this deceived, Here is no bread or wine,*

or ſenſible ſubſtance.] Would you not believe him?

R. 1. Again, I tell you, it is a ſuppoſition not to be put: As if you ſhould ſay, [*If God ſhould ſay*, that *part of the Goſpel*, or *Word of God is falſe, would you not believe him?*] 2. If I know that God telleth me that ſome diſeaſe or falſe *medium*, &c. deceive me or another in particular, I will believe him: But here it is ſuppoſed, 1. That I have aſſurance that it is God that tells me ſo, 2. And that I have no aſſurance that common ſenſe ſaith the contrary. *But* if the *ſenſe of all the World* about, a well ſituate object of ſenſe agree, I will not take that to be *Gods Word* which contradicteth it, till I have *ſome evidence*, which is *better* and *ſtronger* then the *agreeing ſenſes of all the World* to prove it to be ſo. And what evidence muſt that be? I aſſure you ſomewhat greater then the authority of a beaſtly ignorant murdering Pope, and his factious Council.

P. VI. *Carteſius* giveth you an inſtance of deception of ſight: We think a ſquare Tower of a Steeple to be round till we come near it: And the water ſeemeth to us to move when it is the boat.

R. *Carteſius* and you do ſeem to be Confederate, to put out the eye of nature, and tempt the World to infidelity, if not to Atheiſm. 1. *Nature* tells us, that a *diſtant Steeple* or other

other object, is not perfectly *discernible*: and therefore *Nature* forbiddeth us to judge till we come nearer. We speak only of *objects duly situate and qualified*. 2. The failing of the sight there is but *Negative*: *It discerneth not the corners*: but here you feign it to be positive. 3. As the error is corrigible by *nearer approach*, so also by the use of *other senses*. If a man *feel* the Tower that is *square*, he will infallibly perceive it. But if you could prove that this square Tower is no *Tower*, no *Stone*, no *Substance at all*, though all *the World* should judge otherwise, that see it at the *meetest distance*, and *feel* it with their hands, then you did something to the purpose.

So as to the moving water or banks, 1. Motion is not so evident as *substance*. 2. Though *one sense*, through the weakness of the brain be insufficient, the *Intellect* by the *same sense* about other objects, and by *other senses* can *infallibly discern* what that one perceiveth not. 3. And if one mans eyes deceive him who is in the *Boat*, *ten thousand mens* eyes that stand on the firm Land, perceive the truth: But in our case it is all the senses of all the World, in all ages, about the neareſt object, that agree.

P. VII. *Substance* is not the proper object of *sense*, but only *Accidents*: We see, feel, taste,

taſte, ſmell the accidents, but not the ſubſtances.

R. 1. If you can name ſome notional ſpeculator or *Word-maker* that hath ſaid ſo, you think you have *authority* to renounce *humanity* by it. Call it *proper*, or *not-proper*, *ſubſtance* is the certain *object of ſenſe*, as cloathed with its accidents. *Quantity*, and the *res quanta*, are not two things, but one: And he that feeleth or ſeeth quantity, feeleth or ſeeth the *rem quantam*. He that ſeeth or feeleth ſhape or figure, ſeeth or feeleth the thing figured. He that ſmelleth odor, ſmelleth *rem odoratam*; He that ſeeth Colour, ſeeth the *rem coloratam*. When to feel the ſuperficies, you feel the ſubſtance.

2. By this we ſee how by *words* you will unman mankind. Have you *any way of perception* of *corporal ſubſtances* but *by ſenſe*? Do you know that there is *any Earth or Water*, or any *corporal ſubſtance* in the world, or not? If you do, tell us how you know it but by the perception of ſenſe, preſenting it to the Intellect? You know that you muſt *thus know it*, or not at all.

3. And thus ſtill you would bring men with Scepticiſm to infidelity. You would teach men, that they that ſaw Chriſt were not ſure that they ſaw him or any ſubſtance at all, but only the accidents, called quantity, ſhape, colour, &c.

colour. &c. They that ſaw Apoſtles, Miracles, Bibles, Councils, were not ſure that they ſaw any more then accidents, &c.

P. VIII. They that ſaw Angels appearing to them like men, or the Holy Ghoſt deſcending on Chriſt in the ſhape of a Dove, thought they ſaw *Men* and a *Dove*: So *Moſes* Rod did ſeem a Serpent. But their ſenſes did deceive them.

R. Their ſenſes were not at all deceived: And if by raſh judging they would go *beyond ſenſe*, and willfully deceive themſelves, it was their fault. Their ſenſe ſaw the ſhape, or likeneſs of a man and dove. The Text ſaith, not that the Holy Ghoſt was a Dove, but that it *deſcended in the likeneſs of a Dove*: and their ſenſes perceived no more. And this was true. A man conſiſteth of a ſoul, and a body of fleſh and blood: Did ſenſe perceive any of this in the Angels? either ſoul, fleſh or blood? or any ſuch thing in the appearance of a *Dove*? If I ſee your picture or ſtature, is my ſenſe deceived if I take it not for *a living man*? If I ſee it moved, is my ſenſe deceived, if I take it not for any other then a *moving image*? Nature doth not bind me to take every ſimile to be idem; a corps for a man; an image for the perſon. It will be fooliſhneſs ſo to take it. But if this *Angel*, or *Dove*, had come near to the *ſenſes*, all *the ſenſes* of all ſorts of men, and they

they had *seen*, and *felt*, and *tasted*, and *smelt*, all that are the objects of these senses, and yet there had been indeed no visible, tactible, sensible *substance at all*, this had been a deception of the senses remedyless. Christ, I am sure appealed to sense, to prove that he had flesh and blood, and was not a meer spirit. The same I say of *Moses* Rod; either it was really a Serpent or not; If it was, then it was no deception to judge it such: If not, sense was not at all deceived: For it perceived nothing but the similitude and motion, and those (with the substance) were certainly there. But if all mens senses, seeing, feeling, tasting, &c. had been deceived, and there had been indeed no shape of a Serpent, nor any sensible substance at all, but accidents real without any substance this had been indeed a deception of the senses. And if God so subvert mans nature, he will not bind him to do the things which belong to the nature of man to do.

But by all this we may perceive, that there is no end of Controversies with you to be hoped for: For how is it possible to bring any thing to a more satisfying issue, then when the senses of all the World do as clearly perceive it, as any sensible thing can be perceived? If our difference were whether this be Paper, and these be Letters; or whether this be a Pen, a Table, yea, or a substance, and I

should

ſhould appeal to the ſenſe of all the World, and yet this will not ſerve to decide the Controverſie; what end, or hope of ending can there be? I will ſooner look for concord with a mad man, then with men that deny the ſenſes of all the World.

CHAP. III.

The ſecond Argument againſt Tranſubſtantiation: The Contradictions of it;

R. *Arg.* 2. GOd owneth not Contradictions (nor can do.) The Papiſts Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, or nullification of the whole ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, is contradictious: Therefore it is no owned by God.

The Major I know no man that denyeth.

The Contradictions are theſe.

I. You feign many *Accidents* of *no ſubſtance*; which is a groſs contradiction. For to be an *Accident*, is eſſentially *Relative* to a ſubject or ſubſtance: And *ejus eſſe eſt ineſſe*. To be a Father without a Son, or a Son without a Father, a Husband without a Wife, or a wife without a husband, *&c.* are contradictions: And ſo it is to be an *Accident of nothing*, or without a *ſubject*.

Particularly, 1. The *quantity of nothing*, is a contradiction: We can *meaſure* the Bread and

and Wine: To be an inch in longitude, latitude or profundity, and yet to be *no substance*, is a contradiction. To be (as the Wine is) a quart, a Gallon of nothing, is a contradiction.

2. So for *number*; we can number the *wafers* or pieces of *Bread*, and the *Cups* of Wine: And to be *twenty*, *forty*, an *hundred nothings*, is a contradiction.

3. So for the *Weight*. To be an *ounce*, a *pound*, or *ten pound* of *nothing*, is a contradiction.

4. So for the *figure* or *shape*: It is a contradiction to be a *round nothing*, a *square nothing*, &c.

5. So is it to be a *sweet nothing*, a *sharp nothing*, an *austere nothing*, &c. as the Wine is fancied by you.

6. Or to be an *odoriferous nothing*: A *rough* or a *smooth nothing*, &c.

7. Or to be a *white nothing*, or a *red nothing*, or any *coloured nothing*. The same I may say of *site*, and of a multitude of Relations, &c.

II. It is a contradiction, for *nothing* to have all those *real notable effects*, which it is certain that the consecrated Bread and Wine have.

As, 1. That when a man or a beast, is *really nourished by the Bread and Wine*, and *flesh*, and *blood*, and *spirits* are made of it, (as they

may

may live by it many months,) that these should be the *effects of nothing*, or made out of *no substance* by way of *Nutrition*, without a proper Creation.

2. When the consecrated *Bread* and *Wine* do partly turn to *Excrements*, *Urine*, *Dung* and *Spittle*, that all the Excrements are *nothings*, or *made of nothing* without a *new Creation*, is a contradiction.

3. When the *Wine* shal (as it may do) make a Man, or a Swine drunk, that he is made *drunk by nothing*, or no *substance*, when as that *drunkenness* is essentially the operation of the spirits of the Wine upon the spirits of him that drinks it, this also is a contradiction. And God maketh not contradictions true.

P. It is the plea of an Infidel to say that God cannot do this or that. Will you limit the power of the Almighty? Will you say that God cannot make quantity, quality, site, &c. without substance, because we cannot? It is blasphemy to say God cannot.

R. God can do all things that are *works of Power*: God *can do nothing*, which is a work of *impotency*, *defectiveness*, *naughtiness*, or *folly*, or which are contradictions in themselves. And when we say *God cannot*, we do but say either that God is *Perfect* and *Almighty*, or that the thing is *nothing* but a false name, and not capable of being any ones work. God can-

can not lye, becauſe he is perfect & Almighty, and not becauſe he wanteth power. God cannot make you to be a *man* and *no man*, a *ſubſtance* and *no ſubſtance*, in the ſame ſenſe, at the ſame time: becauſe it is a contradiction.

But if this Argument did not hold, and it were no contradiction, for God to overturn his ſetled courſe of Nature, I ſhal ſhew you next, that we have other reaſons enough to judge that he doth it not. If he can make darkneſs to give light, and a clod to be to the World inſtead of the Sun, without changing it, or a ſtone to underſtand and ſpeak without changing it, yet that God doth none of this, both reaſon and experience prove.

CHAP. IV.

The third Argument againſt Tranſubſtantiation: from the certain falſhood of their aſſertion of multitudes of Miracles in it.

R. THat doctrine which aſſerteth a multitude of falſe or feigned miracles is falſe, and not of God: But ſuch is the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. *Ergo.*

I will 1. Shew you what Miracles it aſſerteth; and 2. Prove that they are feigned or falſe.

I. It is a Miracle for *Bread* and *Wine* to be turned into no *Bread* and *Wine*; yea, into *nothing*;

nothing; and this by the *ſpeaking* of *four words*.

II. It is a Miracle (or Contradiction) for the Bread and Wine to be turned into *Chriſts Body* and *Blood*, and yet neither the *matter* nor *form* of it to become any of the matter of Chriſts body and blood.

III. It is a Miracle, (or a contradiction rather as aforeſaid) for the accidents to be the accidents of *nothing*, or no *ſubſtance*; to be the *quantity of nothing*, *the ſhape*, *the number of nothing*, *the colour*, *ſavour*, *ſmell* of nothing, and ſo of all the reſt

IV. It is a Miracle, to have all the ſound ſenſes of all ſorts of men in the world ſo deceived herein, as to perceive *bread*, *wine*, and *ſubſtance*, if there be none.

V. It is a Miracle to have the ſenſes of Mice, and Rats, and Dogs, and other Brutes alſo deceived when they eat and drink it.

VI. It is a Miracle (or contradiction) to have *nothing* without a Creation, to become *excrements*: or elſe thoſe *excrements* to be *nothing* alſo: And the *Accidents* of all thoſe *excrements* to be the *Accidents of nothing*.

VII. It is a Miracle to be *nouriſhed by nothing*: (For you ſay, that it is not *Chriſts Body* and *Blood* that nouriſheth the fleſh.) To have fleſh and blood made of *nothing*, is a creation.

VIII.

VIII. It is a Miracle to be *drunk* with *nothing*, when the *Wine* is annihilated or gone, and *ſeemeth* to be it that cauſeth the effect: Yea, for beaſt or man to be ſo drunk.

IX. It is a Miracle (or contradiction) for Chriſt to eat his own body (as the Papiſts hold he did;) and yet it was his *whole Body*, which did eat his *Body*, and yet he had but one body.

X. It was a Miracle (or contradiction) for *Chriſts* entire body to be nouriſhed by that eaten body, and that the eaten body turned into the ſubſtance of his eating body: And yet all was but one.

XI. It was a Miracle, that Chriſts *eaten body* being not dead, but living with a humane ſoul, ſhould be broken and eaten by him and his diſciples, and yet feel no pain by it.

XII. It was a Miracle that his whole body was on the Croſs, and yet part of it in the diſciples bellies at that time; or at leaſt before that eaten by them.

XIII. It was a Miracle (or contradiction) that Chriſts eaten Body now nouriſheth not the fleſh of any man, and yet did nouriſh the fleſh of the Diſciples before his death. Or if it did not nouriſh them, it was a Miracle that what they ate and drank then did not nouriſh them, (or Chriſt what he ate and drank.)

nothing; and this by the *ſpeaking* of *four words*.

II. It is a Miracle (or Contradiction) for the Bread and Wine to be turned into *Chriſts Body* and *Blood*, and yet neither the *matter* nor *form* of it to become any of the matter of Chriſts body and blood.

III. It is a Miracle, (or a contradiction rather as aforeſaid) for the accidents to be the accidents of *nothing*, or no *ſubſtance*; to be the *quantity of nothing*, *the ſhape*, *the number of nothing*, *the colour*, *ſavour*, *ſmell* of nothing, and ſo of all the reſt

IV. It is a Miracle, to have all the ſound ſenſes of all ſorts of men in the world ſo deceived herein, as to perceive *bread*, *wine*, and *ſubſtance*, if there be none.

V. It is a Miracle to have the ſenſes of Mice, and Rats, and Dogs, and other Brutes alſo deceived when they eat and drink it.

VI. It is a Miracle (or contradiction) to have *nothing* without a Creation, to become *excrements*: or elſe thoſe *excrements* to be *nothing* alſo: And the *Accidents* of all thoſe *excrements* to be the *Accidents of nothing*.

VII. It is a Miracle to be *nouriſhed by nothing*: (For you ſay, that it is not *Chriſts Body* and *Blood* that nouriſheth the fleſh.) To have fleſh and blood made of *nothing*, is a creation.

VIII.

VIII. It is a Miracle to be *drunk* with *nothing*, when the *Wine* is annihilated or gone, and *ſeemeth* to be it that cauſeth the effect: Yea, for beaſt or man to be ſo drunk.

IX. It is a Miracle (or contradiction) for Chriſt to eat his own body (as the Papiſts hold he did;) and yet it was his *whole Body*, which did eat his *Body*, and yet he had but one body.

X. It was a Miracle (or contradiction) for *Chriſts* entire body to be nouriſhed by that eaten body, and that the eaten body turned into the ſubſtance of his eating body: And yet all was but one.

XI. It was a Miracle, that Chriſts *eaten body* being not dead, but living with a humane ſoul, ſhould be broken and eaten by him and his diſciples, and yet feel no pain by it.

XII. It was a Miracle that his whole body was on the Croſs, and yet part of it in the diſciples bellies at that time; or at leaſt before that eaten by them.

XIII. It was a Miracle (or contradiction) that Chriſts eaten Body now nouriſheth not the fleſh of any man, and yet did nouriſh the fleſh of the Diſciples before his death. Or if it did not nouriſh them, it was a Miracle that what they ate and drank then did not nouriſh them, (or Chriſt what he ate and drank,)

XIV. It was a Miracle that the whole Body of Chriſt ſhould ariſe and live, and aſcend to Heaven, when the Diſciples had eaten it.

XV. It is a Miracle that every Receiver eateth the whole Body of Chriſt, and not a part, and yet that he hath but one Body; or, that they eat each a part without dividing him.

XVI. It is a Miracle that as ſoon as the ſpecies of *Bread* and *Wine* periſh or ceaſe in the Eater, Chriſts Body and Blood ceaſeth to be in him, and this without his detriment.

XVII. It is a Miracle that there is ſuch a local diſtance between the conſecrated Bread and Wine all over the World; and yet no ſuch diſtance between the parts of Chriſts body, and yet that bread to be his body.

XVIII. It is a Miracle that Bread and Wine is annihilated or ceaſe every Maſs, and yet that the quantity of corporal matter in the whole World is no whit diminiſhed: or elſe that thoſe four words can ſo annihilate and diminiſh the matter of the World.

XIX. It is a Miracle that Chriſts Body and Blood increaſe not, when ſo many millions of parcels of Bread and Wine are turned into it.

XX. It is a Miracle that Chriſts Body and Blood

Blood is not diminiſh'd, when by the corruption of the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, it vaniſheth away.

XXI. It is a Miracle that Chriſts Body and Blood ſhould be ſo received into the bowels of a wicked man, and yet not be any way defiled by his ſin, nor by his bodily uncleanneſs.

XXII. It is a Miracle that a Baker diſpoſitively, and a Prieſt effectually can make his own God, and eat him when they have done.

XXIII. It is a Miracle that when worms are bred of that which was Bread and Wine, theſe worms are really generated of *nothing*, or created; (or if as ſome ſay, the Bread and Wine do ſubſtantially return again, and breed them, that is another, a double miracle.)

XXIV. And it is a Miracle that the Corporeal matter of the World ſhould by theſe Worms be daily increaſed, out of nothing, or out of meer accidents that have no ſubſtance.

XXV. It is a Miracle that men may be poyſoned by the Sacramental Elements, as ingredients in the mixture, and yet that they are no ſubſtance.

XXVI. It is a Miracle or Contradiction, that when *fleſh* and *blood* (formally ſuch) enter not into the Kingdom of God, but glorified

bodies are all *ſpiritual bodies* (though not Spirits,) and therefore not *fleſh* and *blood*: Yet Chriſts *Body* in the Sacrament ſhould be truly and properly *fleſh* and *blood*, and yet the ſame with his glorified body (which is not fleſh and blood:) which is the Papiſts Doctrine; and the bread turned into ſuch fleſh.

XXVII. It is a Miracle that the ſame *Body* which in Heaven is brighter in glory then the Sun, and exalted above Angels, ſhould yet ſhow no ſigns of glory on the Altar, in the Cup, in the hand, mouth, or belly of him that taketh it, but all its glory be ſo hid.

XXVIII. It is a Miracle (or Contradiction) that Chriſts humiliation ſhould be paſt, and his whole Body glorified, and yet that to be torn with the teeth of a wicked man, to be eaten by Mice, Rats or Dogs, to go into the filthy guts, to be trodden in the dirt, ſhould be neither painful, nor any diminution of the glory of that ſame body. Indeed, his body on the Croſs might be broken, and his blood ſpilt and trodden on, becauſe he was a ſacrifice for ſin; and it was the time of his voluntary humiliation: But now for the ſuffering of death he is crowned with Glory and Honor, *Heb.* 2. 9. 7.

XXIX. It is a Miracle that the *living Body* of our glorified Redeemer ſhould give no evidence or ſign of life; neither ſtir, nor ſpeak,

ſpeak, nor have breath, pulſe, warmth, or other property of life appearing.

XXX. It is a Miracle, at leaſt, that *fleſh* ſhould have none of the common notes or properties of fleſh, not to be made of food, of blood and chyme, not to conſiſt of the *fibræ* which fleſh conſiſteth of; not to have the colour, taſte, odour, or other ſuch accidents of fleſh: And that Blood ſhould have none of theſe notifying accidents of *blood*.

XXXI. It is a Miracle, or Contradiction, that *Chriſt's fleſh* was *broken* before it was broken, ſacrificed before it was ſacrificed, I mean really broken and ſacrificed at his Supper, when yet he was whole, and not really ſacrificed till he was nailed to the Croſs; And ſo that his blood was really and properly ſhed in his Supper, and yet no skin broken, nor his blood really ſhed till his ſide was pierced on the Croſs. And that he that was but *once offered* and *ſacrificed*, ſhould yet be offered and ſacrificed once on one day, and another time on another day.

Here are one and thirty Miracles or Contradictions: Let us hear ſome of the Aggravations of them, as worthy to be conſidered.

I. It is a miracle of theſe Miracles, that there ſhould be as many Miracle-workers as Prieſts in the World: How many thouſand

are they in *France* alone? And ſo in many other Countreys. Whereas in Chriſts own time, they were comparatively but few.

II. That the Pope or any Prelate can make a Miracle-worker when he pleaſe; yea, a thouſand; as if the Holy Ghoſt were at his will.

III. It is a Miracle of theſe Miracles, that a Simoniſt who buyeth the Prieſt-hood with money, doth buy the Holy Ghoſt to work Miracles for that money, which *Simon Magus* was condemned for thinking poſſible. For the Papiſts hold, that the Conſecration of a Simoniacal Prieſt tranſubſtantiateth.

IV. It is a Miracle that all this power of Miracles ſhould be given to flagitious wicked men, Adulterers, Murderers, Drunkards, *&c.*

V. It is a Miracle that all theſe men can work Miracles at their *own will and pleaſure*, at any hour: whereas the Apoſtles had not the Spirit at command, and could not do it when they would.

VI. It is a Miracle that Miracles ſhould be as common as Maſſes, or the Euchariſtical worſhipping of God; not only on every Lords-day in all Church-aſſemblies, but any day or hour elſe in the Week. And ſo Miracles be as ordinary almoſt as to eat and drink.

VII.

VII. It is a Miracle that every wicked Prieſt ſhould do ſo *many Miracles in one*, and ſo many more in number then *Chriſt himſelf* did, in the ſame proportion of time, as far as the Hiſtory of the Goſpel telleth us: Chriſt is quite exceeded by them all.

VIII. It is a Miracle that every wicked Prieſt can work all theſe Miracles *ſo eaſily*, as with the careleſs ſaying over *four words*: When the *Apoſtles* could not caſt out ſome Devils, or work ſome Miracles, and ſome could not be done but by *faſting and prayer*.

IX. It is a Miracle that *every Prieſt* can work all theſe Miracles upon an *unbeliever*, or a *wicked* man: For to ſuch they ſay, it is the *real fleſh and blood of Chriſt*, and *no Bread or Wine*; And the *ſenſes* of all theſe *wicked men* are deceived. Whereas Chriſt himſelf *could not do any great miraculous work* among ſome where he came, *becauſe of their unbelief*.

X. It is a Miracle that *God and the Prieſt* ſhould do theſe foreſaid Miracles on *Mice and Rats*, and other *Beaſts*, by deceiving their ſenſes, which we find not that Chriſt ever did: or that God ſhould feed them with the miraculous accidents aforeſaid.

XI. It is a Miracle of theſe Miracles, that the Prieſt can thus eaſily work Miracles, not only on *other creatures*, but on the *glorified body*

of Christ himself, by the fore-said changes, &c.

XII. It is a miracle, that when Christ wrought his miracles usually before a far smaller number, these Priests work miracles thus before, or on the *senses of all the men in the world* that will be present at the Mass; for all their senses are deceived.

XIII. It is a miracle that the *Abassins*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, *Protestants*, yea any that they call Schismaticks and Hereticks, who do not intend to work any miracle, nor believe Transubstantiation, do yet work miracles in each sacramental administration of the Eucharist, not only *without their knowledge*, *but contrary to their belief*, *and against their wills*: For they say, that even such mens consecration is effectual, *Vid. Aquin.* 3 *q* 82. *d.* 7. *c.*

XIV. Either their Priests consecration worketh all these miracles when they *intend it not* (as if they speak the words in jest or scorn, or in infidelity) or only when they *intend it*. *Vid. Aquin.* 3 *q.* 69. *a* 9 If the first be said, it is a miracle of miracles, that any Priest can work so many and great miracles by a jest or scorn, &c. If not, then all the business is come to nothing, and no one but the Priest knoweth whether there be any such miracle at all, and whether ever he eat the flesh of Christ: And so it will be in the power of the Priest to deceive and damn all the people,

people according to the Papists expesition of Christs words, John 6. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you.*

XV. Either a malicious intention to a wrong end will be effectual in consecration, or not. If not, none but the Priest knoweth that there is any body and blood of Christ, or that ever he received any; because none knoweth, though the Priest intend consecration, whether he intend it to a right end. But if a wicked end will serve (as I think most of them hold) the miracle may be great and sad. For any roguish drunken malicious Priest may undo a Baker or Vintner at his pleasure, and by four words deprive him of all his bread and wine; yea, he might nullifie all the *bread and wine in the City*, and so either make a famine at his pleasure, or else make *whole families and Cities* live still, and be nourished without *any substance* by bare *accidents*, which would be a miracle indeed.

If the Priest can by consecration change *only a convenient quantity of bread and wine*, then all that is *overmuch, is bread and wine after consecration.* If otherwise, why may he not change all the bread and wine in the shop or cellar where he cometh, intending consecration to an ill end?

If he can do it only on *the altar*, then want

of *an altar* would fruſtrat the effect (which they hold not.) But if he can do it without an altar, he may do it in the ſhop and cellar.

If he can do it only on the *bread and wine preſent*, how near muſt it be? Then the words will work *at ſo many* yards diſtance, and not at *ſo many*. Or if he cannot do it *out of ſight*, a *blind Prieſt* cannot do it. But if he can do it on that which is *abſent*, we may fear leſt in an anger he may take away all *the bread and wine* in the Land; at leaſt in a frolick, to try his power.

XVI. And it is ſome aggravation of theſe manifold miracles that a *degraded Prieſt* can do them, becauſe they follow the indelible character: and ſo he that hath once made a miracle-worker, cannot take away his power again, nor his ſin loſe his power. *Vid. Aquin. 3. q. 82. a. 8.* Is not this a marvellous power of miracles, which becometh like a *nature to them* as the power of ſpeaking is?

XVII. Yet is this miracle-working-power more miraculous, in that a mans own *unwillingneſs*, or *repentance* of his calling, cannot hinder the miracle, if he do but ſpeak four words. *Conſent it ſelf* is not neceſſary to it: Let a man *repent* that ever he was a Prieſt, and profeſs that he continueth in that calling againſt his will; yea, let him write, as I now do, *againſt Tranſubſtantiation*, yet all this will not

not hinder his next conſecration from working all the fore-ſaid miracles.

XVIII. It is miraculous, that if you keep a conſecrated wafer never ſo long, if you uſe it never ſo coarſly, if you (as he did who occaſioned the converſion of *M. Anthony Egan*, a late *Iriſh* Prieſt) pawn it at an Ale houſe for thirty ſhillings; if you lay it down for a ſtake at cards or dice, &c. it will *not ceaſe to be Chriſts fleſh* (and ſo by his blood) nor ever becomes bread, or any other ſubſtance till it *corrupt*; and yet in a mans ſtomack it ceaſeth to be Chriſts body, as natural heat corrupteth it by concoction; and yet it is not *Chriſts fleſh* that is concocted.

XIX. It is a miracle of this miracle which *Aquinas*, and others aſſert that *the bread and wine are not annihilated*, but wholly turned into Chriſts body and blood: and yet, as *Vaſquez* ſaith, *It is not that the matter of bread begins to be under the form of Chriſts body*, as *Durandus* held. Saith *Veron Reg. fid. cap.* 5. This *Tranſubſtantiation is neither a change, nor a production of anything; but it is a relation of order between the ſubſtance that doth deſiſt to be, and that into which it doth deſiſt*, And yet ſaith the *Concil. Trident. There is a change made of the whole ſubſtance into*, &c.

XX. Laſtly, it is a miracle that all theſe miracles ſhould be done ſo as not to *appear to*

the

the ſenſes of any man living, either to convert unbelievers, or confirm the faithful; ſo that millions of theſe miracles are *ſeen, and not ſeen*; the Prieſt, and action, and accidents *are ſeen*, but no *miracle* ſeen by any. So that *Aquinas* concludeth 3. *q.* 76. *a.* 7. *Though Chriſt be exiſtent in this Sacrament* per modum ſubſtantiæ, *yet neither bodily eyes, nor our intellects can ſee him, but by faith: no nor the intellect of an Angel can ſee him* ſecundum ſua naturalia; *nor do Devils ſee him, but by faith; nor the bleſſed, but in the divine eſſence.*

All theſe make theſe miracles far more miraculous then the raiſing of *Lazarus* from the dead.

Whether all theſe are miracles, or moſt or many of them contradictions, and therefore impoſſibilities, I make no great matter of at this time. I think it utterly needleſs to add any more to what is ſaid in anſwer to ſuch ſayings as *Aquinas*, 3. *q.* 75. & 76. and other School-men, That *the ſenſes are not deceived, becauſe there are the accidents, and the intellect is by faith preſerved from deception: that the remaining accidents are* in quantitate dimenſiva quaſi in ſubjecto: *that theſe accidents can change an extrinſick body, can be corrupted, can generate worms, can nouriſh, can be broken*, &c. For all this at leaſt confeſſeth, that it is all done by miracle. Though I will ſay: 1. That they could ſcarce

no one Priest in the world is with-

ſcarce have choſen a more unhappy pro-ſubject of accidents then quantity, nor have given more unhappy reaſons for it then *Aquinas* doth, *q.* 77 *a.* 2. *c.* 1. *Becauſe the ſenſe perceiveth that it is* aliquid quantum, *that is coloured.* 2. *Becauſe quantity is the firſt diſpoſition of matter*, &c. For this includeth *matter*: and *aliquid quantum* is a word that giveth away his cauſe: and no accident is more the ſame with its ſubject then *quantity*, or *moles extenſiva*. 2. And he will be long before he will make or prove mans nature to be ſuch, as that his intellect can judge of ſubſtances by believing, as incomplex objects, before it have *perceived them* by ſenſe & imagination. When we ſee, taſte, ſmel, feel, hear them, the intellect will ſuddenly and neceſſarily have ſome *ſpecies* or perception of the *thing*, before it come *logically* to diſpute from *extrinſick media* of teſtimony, what this thing is in a ſecond notion. And our queſtion is, Whether the intellect in *this firſt perception* be deceived, or not? If you diſcharge the intellect from *perceiving* ſubſtances preſently, before it know them by ſecond notions or argument, you will make man quite another thing, then every hour and action tells us he is: But what will not a man ſay when he ſets himſelf only to ſtudy what to ſay for the making good of his undertaken cauſe?

But

But my next work is to prove the falſhood of theſe pretended miracles.

CHAP. V.

The Minor proved; to wit, That theſe Miracles are falſe.

THat theſe are all but feigned miracles, I thus prove.

I. Becauſe the holy Scriptures do plainly deny ſuch an ordinarineſs or commonneſs of the gift of miracles. 1. Cor. 12. 8. 9. 10. 11. *To one is given by the Spirit the word of wiſdom, to another the word of knowledge by the ſame Spirit, to another faith by the ſame Spirit, to another the gifts of healing by the ſame Spirit, to another the working of miracles*, &c. *But all theſe worketh that one and the ſelf ſame Spirit, dividing to every man ſeverally as he will.* 28. 29. *And God hath ſet ſome in the Church, firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diverſities of tongues. Are all Apoſtles? Are all Prophets? Are all Teachers? Are all workers of miracles?* Here it is moſt expreſly told us, that working miracles is a peculiar gift of ſome, and even in thoſe times not common to all that were Prieſts. But the Papiſts make it common to every Prieſt, though a common adulterer, drunkard, murderer or here-

heretick; no one Priest in the world is without it.

II. Though some few that were workers of iniquity might have some such gifts, *Mat.* 7. yet that was so rare, that Nature it self taught men to judge miracles to be signs of divine approbation: so that *Nicodemus* thence argueth, John 3. 2. *No man could do these miracles that thou dost, except God be with him.* And the man John 9. 31. *God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doth his will, him he heareth.* And the people vers. 16 *How can a man that is a sinner, do such miracles?* And it was Christs own proof that he was of God, and his Gospel true; and therefore to *blaspheme his miracles*, by ascribing them to the Devil, was the unpardonable blasphemy of the holy Ghost. And to deny miracles to be a sign of Gods attestation, is to subvert all Christianity. Acts 2. 22. *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you,* &c. John 5. 36 *The same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* John 10. 25. 37. 38 *The works that I do in my Fathers Name, they bear witness of me,* &c. *If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.* John 14. 11. *Believe*

me

me for the very works ſake. John 15. 24 *If I had not done among them the works that no other man did, they had not had ſin.*

This alſo was *Pauls* proof of his Apoſtleſhip, 2. *Cor.* 12. 12. *Rom.* 15. 19 *Acts* 14. 3. *and* 15. 12. yea, and of the truth of all the Apoſtles doctrine: Heb. 2. 3. 4 *God alſo bearing them witneſs both with ſigns and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the holy Ghoſt, according to his own will.* Therefore that doctrine is unlike to be true, which tells us that *every wicked Prieſt in the world,* though a *Simoniſt,* or an *enemy of Chriſt, & godlineſs, & drowned with all vice,* is ſuch a *conſtant miracle-worker:* when *God hateth all the workers of iniquity,* Pſal. 5. 5.

III. But though this reaſon be but probable, this following is demonſtrative to a believer.

That doctrine which maketh every ignorant, wicked, or heretical Prieſt in the world, far to excel the Prophets, Apoſtles, and Chriſt himſelf, in the greatneſs, number, and facility of miracles, is falſe. But ſuch is this doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

I know that Chriſt telleth his Apoſtles, *Greater works then theſe ſhal ye do.* But firſt, there are *greater works* (ſuch as the converting of greater numbers in the world) which are not *greater miracles.* 2. And what was promiſed to the Apoſtles, as to miracles, was not

not promiſed to every Prieſt in the world.

I appeal to the conſciences of ſober Chriſtians, whether it ſound not as an arrogant, if not blaſphemous ſpeech, to ſay, *That Chriſt and his Apoſtles did fewer and ſmaller miracles*, proportionable to their time, *then every Prieſt*.

And as to the Minor, it is ſoon proved in its parts.

1. As to the greatneſs of the miracles, thoſe of Chriſt were exceeding great, eſpecially his raiſing *Lazarus*, and his own reſurrection, his turning water into wine, and his feeding thouſands with a little food, *&c.* But he that will examine *Tranſubſtantiation*, as afore deſcribed, ſhal find it to have more that is *contrary to nature*, then all theſe by far. The ſubſtance of the dead body of Chriſt, or *Lazarus*, did not vaniſh, but remained to be the *organized recipient matter* of the re-entring ſoul. There were *no accidents without ſubſtances*, or other ſuch things, as are mentioned before. The multiplying of food, could at the moſt be but a new creation; but it was real food, and none of the contradictions or abſurdities before recited. The turning of water into wine, was likeſt this, in the Papiſts opinion; but indeed little like it. For the matter of the water there remained, with the form of wine, and ſo became the mattter of wine, and did not vaniſh: And here was

re al

real wine, and *real ſubſtance*, and *not accidents without ſubſtances*, *deceiving all the ſenſes or intellectual perceptions.* The ſame may be ſaid of the miracles of the Apoſtles, compared with Tranſubſtantiation.

2. And as to the *number*, though Chriſts and his Apoſtles miracles were *very many*, yet there is no Scripture evidence that they were for number comparable, for ſo much time, to every Prieſts. Chriſts miracles are ſet down in the ſacred Hiſtory in ſuch order, & the Evangeliſts ſo much agree in reciting the ſame miracles, that though *S. John* ſay, *the world could not contain the Books that ſhould be written*, &c. yet we find no probability that they were near ſo common as Maſſes are: When in ſeveral places where Chriſt came, they that looked after miracles and ſigns, were denyed them, and had none, but were put off to the *ſign of the Prophet Jonah*, &c. Yea, *Herod* and *Pilat* were in this denyed their deſired ſatisfaction, and they that call to him for a miracle on the croſs. And ſo of the Apoſtles. But every Prieſt doth his miracles *as oft as there is a Maß*, though every day.

3. And as to the facility I ſaid before, that in *his own Countrey, among his own kindred, he could do no mighty works, ſave that he layd his hands on a few ſick folk, and healed them, and he marvelled at their unbelief*, Mark 6.4. 5. 6. And he

he ſometime *groaned in ſpirit, and wept*, as for *Lazarus*. And the Diſciples *could not caſt out a Devil*, Mark 9. 18. 28. Luke 9. 40. It was not to be done *but by faſting and prayer*. It is like *Paul* would have cured *Trophimus* if he could, when he *left him ſick*. And as holy men ſpake, not when, nor as they pleaſed, but *when and as they were inſpired by the holy Ghoſt*: So did they work miracles, not arbitrarily, but at ſuch times, and in ſuch manner as the Spirit moved them. But any, the moſt wicked Prieſt, can do it *at his pleaſure, any hour of the day*, and that but by reciting, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*. Many other diſparities appear in what is ſaid before.

IV. The end of the gift of miracles, confuteth the feigned miracles of Tranſubſtantiation. The end of Chriſts gift was to prove him to be of God, as is afore ſhewed, and to prove his Apoſtles to be of God, and to confirm the Goſpel which they preached, *Mark* 16 17. 18. 19. 20. *Heb.* 2. 4. As the gift of Tongues, ſo other wonders, were to convince unbelievers, 1. *Cor.* 14. *Acts* 2. & 4. 30. & 5. 12. & 7. 36. & 8. 13. & 14. 3. 2. *Cor.* 12. 12.

But the miracles of Tranſubſtantiation are known to no unbeliever, nor to any one in the world by any ſenſe, and have no ſuch end, but a contrary effect.

The

The Apoſtles who were to convert the world, and next Chriſt, to do the greateſt good, were therefore to do the greateſt miracles: and it was their argument for Chriſt, John 7. 31. *When Chriſt cometh, will he do more miracles then theſe which this man hath done?* Yet now every ignorant Prieſt pretendeth to far more, who doth but tempt infidels to deride Chriſtianity by the pretence; as we do Mahometaniſm, for *Mahomet's* ſport pretended with the Moon, and other ſuch delirations.

V. God is not to be ſaid to work miracles, and croſs the eſtabliſhed courſe of nature without proof. But theſe pretended miracles have no proof, &c. No man living perceiveth them by ſenſe. And that God telleth us of no ſuch things by ſupernatural revelation, ſhal be further ſhewed anon: In the mean time, it may ſatisfie us that they bring us no proof, but their own affirmation, which they require us to believe.

VI. The matter of theſe pretended miracles, is expreſly contradicted by the Word of God, as ſhal be proved in the next Chapter.

VII. *Ad hominem*, Do not the Papiſts forget themſelves here, and contradict their other ſuppoſitions?

1. They make miracles to be one evidence of ſan-

So they do, by forbidding to eat fleſh in Lent: and yet ſay they eat Chriſts fleſh in Lent: When *Irenæus* cited by E-

ſanctity, and therefore *canonize* men, when they think that they have proof that they wrought miracles: & yet maintain, that a whoremonger, drunkard or heretick, may do many more.

2. They make miracles a proof that they are the *true Church*, and ſay, that among us there *are no miracles*; and yet they confeſs that every Prieſt, among us, and all others, whom they account Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, do more miracles then Chriſt did, if they conſecrat frequently.

cumenius com. in 1. *Pet.c.*3. bringeth in *Blandina* proving to the Heathens that Chriſtians did not eat fleſh and drink blood in the Euchariſt, becauſe that they uſe even to abſtain, for exercice ſake from lawful fleſh.

3. They burn men to aſhes for *working miracles*, even for *making God*; if ſo be they do it not in the *Roman* faſhion.

4. They confeſs that the *other Sacraments* are not thus made up of miracles; no not *Baptiſm*, which is our *Chriſtening*, and waſheth us from our ſins: And yet *this Sacrament alone*, muſt by a multitude of miracles differ from the reſt.

5. Whether the doctrine of their *S. Thomas*, and his followers, and others, that the *formal words of this Sacrament have a created effective vertue, by which they inſtrumentally make*

ths

the change (3. *q.* 78. *a.* 4. *c.*) be not an absurdity rather then a proper miracle. For *words* physically move but the *air* first, and the *terminus* of the *airs motion* (*e. g.* the *ear*) next: and next that, if it be an intellectual, or other animal recipient, the sense, and *fantasie* next, and so on: But the *bread* and *wine* have no *sense*, nor *fantasie*, nor *intellect*. And to say that the *moved air* is the means of turning them into the body and blood of Christ, is still to multiply miracles.

6. Do they not too much magnifie the *common work*, & consequently the *office of a Priest*, above the work of a *Pope* or *Prelat*, who seldom consecrat, when the Priest worketh so many miracles more then they?

7. They conclud that a sinner that hath *voluntatem peccandi*, receiveth Baptism in vain, as to its ends of pardoning him, and therefore should not receive it, *Concil. Rom. Epist. Gregor.* 7 *Aquin.* 3. *q* 68. *a.* 4. *c.* &c. And yet, be the sinner never such an hypocrit or infidel, he eateth Christs real flesh nevertheless, yea against his will, if he do but the outward act.

8. Is it not strange that an infidel receiveth as verily the real flesh and blood of Christ as a Saint, and yet not *the benefits or effects*; as if Christs flesh and blood could be in a mans body without his benefit, when he hath promi-

promiſed, that *he that eateth him, ſhal live by him?* Yet ſee the meaſures of their faith and Church. Saith *Aquinas* 3. *q.* 80. *a.* 3. *ad* 2. *Unleſs perhaps an infidel intend to receive that which the Church giveth, though he have not true faith about other articles, or about this Sacrament.* Then he may receive ſacramentally.

CHAP. VI.

The fourth Argument. This miraculous Tranſubſtantiation is expreſly contrary to the Word of God in Scripture.

Arg. 4. THe Papiſts ſay, that there is no bread after the words of conſecration: Gods Word ſaith, there is *bread* after the conſecration; therefore the Papiſts ſpeak contrary to the Word of God.

I. In 1. *Cor.* 11. it is called expreſly *bread*, after conſecration, no leſs then three times in three verſes together, 26 27. 28. *For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye ſhow the Lords death till he come. Wherefore whoſoever ſhal eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, ſhal be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.* Here they that call for *expreſs words of Scripture* for our doctrine, without our conſequences, may ſee their own faith expreſly contradi-

tradicted, and our oppoſition juſtified: The holy Ghoſt here expreſly calleth it *bread*; and yet no expreſsneſs nor evidence will ſatisfie them.

P. By *bread* is meant that which *was bread* before, or elſe that which *nouriſheth* the ſoul as *bread* doth the body: and ſo it is metonymically only called *bread*, as Chriſts fleſh is called *bread* in *John 6.*

R. Why then do you call for *expreſs* texts of Scripture as our proof, when that *expreſsneſs* ſignifieth nothing with you; but you can ſay, it is a *metonomie*, or a *metaphore* at your pleaſure. But you ſay ſo againſt notorious evidence: The Apoſtle calleth it *bread*, ſo often over and over, as if he had fore-ſeen your inhumane hereſie: He calleth it *the bread which is to be eaten*, joyned with *drinking the cup*; never once calling either of them the *fleſh or blood of Chriſt*, but as he reciteth Chriſts words which he expoundeth. Yea, he telleth us, that *eating this bread, and drinking this cup, is to ſhow the Lords death till he come*; where he calleth us to look back at *Chriſts death* as paſt, in our *commemoration*, and to *look forward* to his *perſonal coming as future*; but never telleth us that we muſt kill Chriſt, and eat him our ſelves (when we have made him;) nor that his body is there preſent under the accidents of bread and wine.

But

But the reſt of the Scriptures as expreſly juſtifie our doctrine, 1. Cor. 10. 15. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion* (or *communication*) *of the blood of Chriſt?* And *the bread which we break, is it not the communion* (or *participation*) *of the body of Chriſt?* Here it is the *cup* and the *bread* after conſecration, if the holy Ghoſt may be believed.

And in the next words, the Apoſtle repeateth it in his reaſon: *For we being many, are one bread, and one body; for we all partake of one bread* (or loaf.) Is not here expreſs proof?

So *Acts* 20. 7. When we came together to *break bread*, &c. And *v.* 11. He aſcending and *breaking bread*, and *eating*, &c. Here it is twice more called *bread* after the *conſecration*, which ever went before the *breaking*.

So *Acts* 2. 41. 46. it is twice more called *breaking of bread*.

And what elſe can the recitation of Chriſts inſtitution mean, 1. Cor. 11. 23. 24. *Panem accepiſſe, fregiſſe*; to have *taken bread*, and *having given thanks, to have broken?* What is it that he *brake?* It is non ſenſe if it have no accuſative caſe that it reſpects. And plain Grammatical conſtruction tells us then, that it muſt be that before mentioned, What he *took* he *bleſſed*, and *brake*, and *gave*: But he *took bread* and the *cup*, &c. The ſame is in *Mat.* 26. 26. 27 and the other Evangeliſts.

II. The Scriptures expreſly, *Acts* 2. &c. make the killing of Chriſt, and drawing his blood, to be the hainous ſin of the *Jews*, for which ſome repented, and others were caſt off: Therefore it is not to be believed, that Chriſt did firſt *kill* or *tear himſelf*, and *ſhed his own blood*; or that his diſciples did kill him, or tear his fleſh, and ſhed his blood, before the *Jews* did it. And if they tore his fleſh, and drank his blood, and yet killed him not, the event altered not the fact. The *Jews* did but *break his fleſh*, and *ſhed his blood*. If you flie to a *good intention*, *Paul* will come in for ſome further excuſe for his perſecution.

III. 1. Cor. 10. 21. *Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lords table*, and of *the table of Devils*, &c. Here note, 1. That the ſame phraſe is uſed of the participation of the Lords myſteries and the Devils. But it was not the fleſh and blood, or the ſubſtance of Devils which the Idolaters ever intended to partake of, but only their *ſacrifices*.

2. It is here called only the *table* and the *cup*, and not the *fleſh* and the *blood*.

3. It is ſaid, that they *could not partake of both*: whereas according to the Papiſts doctrine, if a man ſhould partake of the *Idols ſacrifice* in the morning, and of the *Lords table* in the evening, without repentance, he ſhould

really

really partake of Christs own flesh & blood; which the text saith cannot be done.

P. It meaneth only, you *cannot lawfully*, or you ought not to partake of both, but not that it is impossible, or never done.

R. No doubt but it meaneth that they *ought not*, or *cannot lawfully*; but that is not all: The text plainly meaneth, *you cannot have communion with both*. You may take the *bread and wine* at your peril; but you cannot partake of it as a *sacramental feast* which God prepareth you, & so partake of Christ therein.

And the same is said, expounding this, 2. Cor. 6. 15. *What concord hath Christ with Belial*, &c. *and what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols?* Intimating that communion with God and Idols, Christ and *Belial*, are so far inconsistent. But by the Papists doctrine, an Idolater and son of *Belial*, may partake of the very *substance of Christs body and blood into his body*, as verily as he partaketh of his meat and drink.

IV. The Scripture teacheth us expresly to judge of sensible things by sense, Luke 24. 39. *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have*. And *when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet*. And v. 43. *he did eat before them*, to confirm their faith. But they could have no more sensible

evidence of any of this, then we have of the being of *bread and wine*, or ſome ſenſible ſubſtance after conſecration. John 2. 9. *they taſted the water turned into wine*, & were convinced.

P. But the body of Chriſt here, is not a ſenſible thing.

R. But *bread* and *wine* are ſenſible things.

P. But *they are not there*, and ſo are no objects of ſenſe.

R. But all our ſenſes ſay, that they are there, and by them we muſt judge.

P. Your ſenſes perceive nothing but accidents; and your *underſtanding muſt believe God*, and ſo as you noted out of *Aquinas* before, there is no deceit either of ſenſe or intellect.

R. Though this be anſwered fully before, I will again tell you, that theſe two notorious falſhoods are all that you have to ſay againſt humanity in this caſe, that is worth the noting. 1. It is falſe that you ſay, that *ſenſe perceiveth not ſubſtance*. When I take up a ſtaff or ſtone in my hand, I do not only feel roughneſs or ſmoothneſs, &c. but a *ſubſtance*: It is a *quantitative* and *qualitative ſubſtance*, which I feel, taſte, ſmel, ſee and here: And this I perceive by *ſenſation* it ſelf, as the *medium* to the *intellect*. It is not the *ſenſe* indeed, but the *intellect* that giveth it the *Logical notion* or *definition* of a *ſubſtance*; but it is the *ſenſe it ſelf* that by

ſenſa-

ſenſation perceiveth it; and to deny this, is to deny all ſenſe.

And if it were no ſo, how could any ſuch *ſubſtance* be known, when it cannot come into the intellect but by the ſenſe?

II. Note. Your great cheat, or error, is by confounding the firſt and *natural neceſſary perception* of a *ſenſible ſenſatum*, or *incomplex object* by the *intellect*, with the *ſecond conception* of the *names of things*, or of organical ſecond notions, and the *third conception* of them artificially by the uſe of theſe names and organical notions, and the fourth perception of conſequents from thoſe conceptions. To know by *believing*, is but the third or fourth ſort of knowledge, and preſuppoſeth the two firſt. If a man had never heard a name or word in his life, yet by ſenſation, as ſoon as he ſaw, ſmelt, taſted, heard, handled things, his intellect would have had a perception of the thing it ſelf as it was ſenſate: and this is the *intellects firſt perception*. And this is it which falleth under our queſtion, *Whether the intellect in this firſt perception of a ſubſtance, or thing as ſenſate, be deceived or not*, when the thing hath the conditions of an object before mentioned? 2. Next this, we learn or invent names and *organical notions* for things: and whether theſe be *true or falſe*, and whether they be *apt or inept*, is all one. This is but an arbitrary work

of art, 3. Next this, we conceive of things by the means of these *names* and *second notions*, and examine the *congruence*; and so we define them: And this is but a work of *artificial reasoning*, and presupposeth the first *natural necessary* perception. Now faith belongeth partly to this, and partly to the fourth, which is, the raising of conclusions, and the weaving of methods; and presupposeth the first, yea, and the second; It is but an assent given by the means of an extrinsick testimony of God, that this particular *Word is true*, &c. Now if the intellect in its *first perception* (*natural and necessary*) of the *thing it self, as sensate*, be deceived, if *faith* should be contrary to it. 1. It must be such a *faith* which is the *immediat contrary perception of a sensate obj.* &; which is *no faith*, nor is any such possible, properly called faith. 2. And if faith can come after, and undeceive the intellect, by saying that God saith otherwise, yet this would be no *prevention of its deception, but a cure*, presupposing the said deception as the disease to be cured. So that to say as *Aquinas*, that *faith preventeth the deceit of the intellect*, is a falshood contrary to the nature of man, and his natural way of acting, as he is composed of soul and body. I have said this over again, lest error get advantage by the brevity & unobservedness of that which I said before.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Argum. 5. *All these miracles have not the least proof; yea, the Scriptures fully direct us to a cross interpretation of the Papists pretended proofs, which also are renounced by themselves.*

I Know of no Scripture proof in the world that the Papists pretend to, but the words, *This is my body*, and, *This is my blood*, and such like. And that these are no proof, I shal fully prove to any impartial man.

1. The very *nature of the Sacrament* instituted by Christ, with his expressed *end*, command our reason to expound the word [*is*] of *signification*, representation, or exhibition; and the word [*body*] and [*blood*] of a new *relative form* only; that is, of a *body and blood representative*, which is all one in effect. As a piece of gold, silver, or brass, is by the law and stamp turned really into the *Kings current coyn*, and so hath a new *relative form*, so that you may truly say, that there is a change made of the gold or silver into the Kings coyn; and it is no more to be called *meer gold or silver*, though it be *gold* and *silver* still; because the *form denominateth*, and the new form is now that in question which must denominate. Or as a Prince that is married in effgie, or by a representative to a woman, is not there

perſonally, and yet it is aptly ſaid, *This is the Prince which is betrothed or married to thee.* Or as we ſay of pictures, *This is Peter, or Paul or John.* Or as when we deliver a man poſſeſſion of a houſe by a key, or of land by a twig and a turf, or of a Church by the belrope, &c. and ſay, *Take, this is ſuch a houſe, or ſuch a piece of land, or Church,* &c. As this is ordinary intelligible ſpeech among all men, ſo Chriſt tells them that he would be ſo underſtood.

1. In that his *real natural body ſpake this* of the *bread and wine* which was not his natural body: His real natural body was preſent, viſible, entire, unwounded, his blood unſpilt, and did eat and drink (the *other*, as the Papiſts hold, as being the ſame.) And can any living man imagine, that the Diſciples who underſtood not his death, reſurrection, aſcenſion, &c. yet underſtood by theſe four words, when they ſaw Chriſts body alive and preſent, that this bread and wine was that ſame body and blood, without any more queſtioning?

2. In that he bids them, *Do this in remembrance of him*; which plainly ſpeaketh a commemorating ſign. Who will ſay at his laſt farewell when he is parting with his friends, *I will ſtay among you*, or *keep me among you, in remembrance of me?* So for Chriſt to ſay, *Eat me in remembrance of me*, were ſtrange.

II. It may put all out of controverſie, to find

find that Chriſts words of *one half of the Sacrament are* (as they confeſs) *figurative*; therefore the *other* muſt be ſo judged alſo. Luke 22 20. *This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you.* 1. Cor. 11. 25. *This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood.* And here no man denyeth a double trope at leaſt: no man expoundeth it, that the *cup* or the *wine was the New Teſtament it ſelf.* And yet it is as expreſly ſaid, as it is that the *bread* is the *body* it ſelf. How then will they prove that one is ſpoken properly, and the other figuratively?

III. There is no more found in theſe words to aſſert the bread to be Chriſts body, then is found in a multitude of ſuch phraſes in Scripture, aſſerting things which all men expound otherwiſe. As in John 15. 1 *I am the vine, and my Father is the husbandman.* John 10. 7 9. *I am the door*, &c John 10 14 *I am the good ſhepherd, and know my ſheep.* Pſal. 22. 6. *I am a worm, and no man* (which being a propheſie of Chriſt, a heretick imitating you, might deny Chriſts humanity.) 1. Cor. 10. 4. *That Rock was Chriſt* &c. 1 Cor. 12. 27 *Ye are the body of Chriſt* &c. Mat 5 13 14 *Ye are the ſalt of the earth: Ye are the light of the world*, &c. John 6 63. *The words that I ſpeak unto you, they are ſpirit, and they are life.* Abounddance ſuch are in the Scripture, as, all fleſh is graſs; Chriſt is the Lamb of God: the Lyon

of the Tribe of *Juda*: the bright morning ſtar: the head corner ſtone, &c.

And it is yet more fully ſatisfactory, that the *H. brew* conſtantly putteth *[is]* for *[ſignifieth]* as you may find in all the Old Teſtament, having no other word ſo fit to expreſs ſignifying by: And as Chriſt ſpake after that manner, ſo the New Teſtament ordinarily imitateth: as *Daniel* and the *Revelation* agree in ſaying, of the viſions, *this is* ſuch or ſuch a thing, in ſtead of *this ſignifieth it*. So Chriſt, *Mat.* 13. 21. 22. 23. 37. 38. 39 He that ſoweth *is* the Son of man: the field is the world: the good ſeed are the children of the Kingdom: the tares are the children of the wicked one: the enemy is the Devil, the Harveſt is the end: the reapers are the Angels, &c. And thus ordinarily.

IV. Yea, the ſame kind of phraſe uſed before in the Paſsover, teacheth us how to expound this: Exod. 12. 11. *Ye ſhal eat it in haſte, it is the Lords Paſſover*, &c. verſ. 27. *It is the ſacrifice of the Lords Paſſover.*

V. Yea, the ordinary way and phraſe of Chriſts teaching may yet farther put us out of doubt. For he uſually taught by parables, and expreſſeth his ſenſe by ſuch aſſertions: As Mat. 13. 3. *Behold a ſower went out to ſow*, &c. Luke 15. 11. 12. *A certain man had two ſons, and the younger ſaid*, &c. Luke 12. 16. *The ground*

ground of a certain rich man, &c. Luke 16. 19. *There was a certain rich man*, &c. Mat. 21. 28. *A certain man had two ſons*, &c. Verſ. 33. *There was a certain houſholder which planted a vineyard*, &c. The Goſpel aboundeth with ſuch inſtances, which teach us how to interpret theſe words of Chriſt.

VI. But moſt certainly all thoſe forementioned texts teach it us, which expreſly call it *bread* after the conſecration. If we will not believe the holy Ghoſt himſelf, who ſo frequently calleth it *bread*, it is in vain to alledge any text of Scripture in the controverſie.

Now to feign a courſe of ordinary miracles, greater and more then Chriſts, and this to every Prieſt, how ignorant and impious ſoever, to pretend that every Pope and Biſhop can for money ſell the holy Ghoſt, or the gift of miracles, in ordination; and all this when no eye ſeeth the miracles, when it is confeſſed that Angels cannot *naturally ſee it*, yea when mens ſenſes perceive the contrary; & all this, becauſe that Chriſt ſaid, *This is my body*, while aboundance ſuch ſayings in Scripture, yea the words about the *cup it ſelf*, are confeſſed to be tropical, and when the Scripture expreſly telleth us that there is bread. Judge whether it be poſſible for Satan to have put a greater ſcorn upon the Chriſtian faith, or a greater

ſcan-

ſcandal before the enemies of it, or a greater hinderance to the worlds converſion, then to tell them, you muſt renounce not only your humanity, but all common ſenſe, if you will be Chriſtians, and be ſaved, or ſuffered to enjoy your eſtates and lives.

VII Laſtly, it is ordinary with their ſubtileſt School-men, to confeſs that this their doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation cannot be proved from Scripture, and that they believe it only becauſe their *Church ſaith it*, which muſt be believed, and becauſe that by the ſame *Spirit* which wrote the Scripture, the *Church is taught* thus to expound it. So that all their faith of this is by them reſolved into a fanatick pretence of *inſpiration*; as I have elſewhere ſhewed out of *Durandus*, *Paludanus*, *Scotus*, *Ockam*, *Quodl.* 6. *li.* 5 *q.* 31. *Rada vol.* 4. *cont.* 7. *a.* 1. *pag.* 164 165.

And no General Council ever determined it, till that at *Rome* under *Innocent* the third; where, ſaith *Matth. Paris*, many decrees were propoſed, or brought in by the Pope, which ſome liked, and ſome diſliked. And this was 1215. years after Chriſts birth. And *Stephanus Æduenſis* is the firſt in whom the name of Tranſubſtantiation is found, about the year 1100.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Arg. 6 *From the nature of a Sacrament.*

Arg. 6. THat doctrine which by conſequence denyeth the Lords Supper to be a true Sacrament, is falſe.

The Papiſts doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation by conſequence denyeth the Lords Supper to be a true Sacrament: therefore the Papiſts doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is falſe.

The *major* I know no man that will deny that we have now to deal with.

The *minor* needeth no other proof then the common definition of a Sacrament, & Chriſts own deſcription of this Sacrament in the Scripture.

1. *Aquinas* concludeth 3 *q.* 60. *a* 1. that a *Sacrament is a ſign*; and *a.* 2. that it is a ſign of a thing ſacred, as it ſanctifieth men: and *a.* 3. that it is a rememorative ſign of Chriſts Paſſion, a demonſtrative ſign of Gods grace, and a prognoſticating ſign of future glory: And *a.* 4. that it muſt be *res ſenſibilis*, a *ſenſible thing*, it being natural to man to come to the knowledge of things intelligible by things ſenſible, and the Sacrament ſignifieth to man ſpiritual & intelligible goods: & *a.* 5. that they muſt be things of divine determination, &c.

But, 1. If the bread and wine be gone, there

is

is nothing left to be a ſign, a *real ſenſible ſign*, to lead us to the knowledge of ſpiritual and intelligible things. If they ſay that the *ſpecies* of *bread* and *wine* is the *ſenſible ſign*, what mean they by that cheating word *ſpecies*? Not the *ſpecifying form*, or matter, but only the *outward appearance*. And is it a true or a falſe appearance? If true, then there is bread and wine: If falſe, it is a falſe ſign. And what is that falſe appearance which God maketh a Sacrament of? It is plainly nothing but the accidents of *bread* and *wine* without the ſubſtance. But, 1. When they take the cup from the laity, and deny them half the Sacrament, ſure there are then no *accidents of wine*. Is there either quantity, color, ſmel, taſte, &c. of wine? They will not ſay it. So that here is no *ſenſible ſign*, as to one half.

2. And herein they deal far more inhumanely with us then the infidels themſelves: for when they plead againſt Chriſt and Scripture, they grant that the *common principles* and *notitiæ*, which all mankind acknowledge, are the *certain unqueſtionable light of nature*. But the Papiſts deny not only the *notitias communes*, but *common ſenſe*. It is nothing with them to damn all the world, that will not believe con-

See my *More Reaſons for the Chriſtian Religion*, and the Lord *Herbert de Veritate*.

contradictions. They ſay that the *quantity* of *nothing*, endued with the *qualities*, the *actions*, the *paſſion*, the *relations*, the *quando*, *ubi*, *ſitus* of *nothing*, is the ſacramental ſign. Inhumane contradiction! 1. *Gaſſendus* and others ſay truly, that an *accident* is not properly *res*, but *modus rei*, *vel qualitas*, as he calleth it. 2. *Quantity* doth not really differ a *re quanta*: and to ſay, *the length, breadth, profundity of nothing*, is a notorious contradiction. And ſo it is of the other accidents. There is no *real ſenſible ſign*, and therefore no Sacrament, where there is *nothing* but the *quantity*, *color*, *taſte*, *ſmel*, &c. of nothing.

3. And they cannot, they dare not ſay, that Chriſts real fleſh and blood, is the ſacramental ſign. For, 1. It is not ſenſible. 2. It ſhould be then the ſign of it ſelf. The ſign and the thing ſignified, cannot be the ſame.

II. The very ſubſtantiality or corporeity of the bread and wine as ſuch, is part of the ſign: As Chriſt ſaith, *Behold and handle me, a ſpirit hath not fleſh and blood, as ye ſee me have:* So he taketh corporeal bread and wine in their ſight, and breaketh it, and powreth it out, and giveth it them to ſee, to feel to taſte, to eat, that they may know it is *true bread and wine*, the ſigns of his true body and blood. So that to deny the corporeity, is to deny Chriſts corporeity in its ſigns, and tendeth to

the

the old hereſie of them that held that Chriſt had but a fantaſtical body, or was not indeed crucified, but ſeemed ſo to be. They teach hereticks to argue, *The ſign was no real ſubſtance, therefore neither the thing ſignified.*

III. The nutritive uſe of the bread and wine was another part of the ſign, as all confeſs. As *bread* and *wine* are the nutriment of the body, and life of man, ſo is Chriſt crucified meritoriouſly, and Chriſt glorified efficiently, the life of the ſoul. And he that denyeth the nutritive ſign, denyeth the Sacrament: but it is not the falſe appearance, or fantaſm, or accidents of *bread* and *wine*, that are the natural nouriſhers of man: therefore he that denyeth the nouriſhing ſubſtance, denyeth the real ſenſible ſacramental ſign.

Saith *Bellarmin de Euchar. l. 3. c. 23 In the Euchariſt we receive not corporal food that the fleſh may be thence nouriſhed and made fat; but only to ſignifie inward refection.* So that he acknowledgeth this to be part of the ſacramental ſign. So *Gregor. Valent.* ſaith, That *the chief and eſſential ſignification of this Sacrament, is that which by external nouriſhment is ſignified the internal ſpiritual refection of the ſoul by the body of Chriſt.* So that denying the nouriſhing ſign, is deſtroying the eſſence of the Sacrament.

IV. The *breaking of the bread*, and *powring out the wine*, is confeſſedly another part of the ſacra-

ſacramental ſenſible ſign. But, 1. When there is no wine, there is no powring it out. 2. And if there be no bread neither, there is no breaking it. Can that be broken which is not? They that deny, as the Papiſts do, that the *bread* is *broken* (ſaying that only the quantity of nothing is broken) deny the ſenſible ſacramental ſign.

And here I may note, that we do not well to contend with them for denying the cup only to the laity, and granting them only the *bread*, when indeed they grant neither, but deny them both: There is, ſay they, no more *bread* then *wine*, but only a falſe appearance of it.

V. Laſtly, the Apoſtle, 1. *Cor.* 10. 16. 17. ſheweth that one ſacramental uſe of the bread was to ſignifie the *unity of Chriſtians*, who are *one bread*, and *one body*, as *one loaf* is made of many *corns*. But that cannot be one, which is nothing: *Ens, unum & verum convertuntur*. To ſay with *Greg. Valent.* and *Bellarmin*, that becauſe it *was once bread*, and *one bread*, therefore the accidents of it remaining now ſignifie that we are *one bread*; is but to ſay, that there was once a fit ſign, but then there wanted the form. Now after conſecration, there is no ſacramental ſign, but yet there is a ſacramental form: And in what *matter* is that form? Doubtleſs it can be no where but in the

the brain or mind of man, that is, man can remember that once he ſaw bread: this is the *ſpecies of bread* in his intellect: this *ſpecies* is the *ſign*: and ſo we have found out another ſenſe of the *ſpecies of bread*, then many think on; to wit, it is that which is called, *The ſpecies intentionalis*, or the *idea* or conception of *bread* in a *mans fantaſie and mind*: And ſo indeed the Sacrament is with them an *inviſible thing*; for it is only in mens minds: There is no Sacrament on the Altar, but in the thoughts; and ſo who hath a Sacrament, and who not, we know not: and a man may by thinking, make a Sacrament when he will.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Novelty of Tranſubſtantiation.

R. I Once thought to have next proved out of the current of Antiquity, the novelty of this inhumane doctrine of the Papiſts, and that the Ancients commonly confeſſed, that there was true *bread* and *wine* remaining in the Sacrament after conſecration. But, 1. I ſhould but tempt and weary ordinary Readers, who neither need any ſuch arguments (having ſenſe and Scripture to give them ſatisfaction) nor are able to try them: For it is an indirect kind of dealing, to expect that the unlearned, or thoſe that are ſtrangers to the Wri-

Writings of the Ancients, ſhould believe this or that to be their mind and ſayings, meerly becauſe I tell them ſo. And if they read the plaineſt words, they know not whether I rightly recite them, but by believing me. And it is as unreaſonable on the other ſide, that the Papiſts ſhould expect, either by their citations or their general affirmations, that the Readers ſhould believe them, that the Ancients were for Tranſubſtantiation. Till men can both read the Authors themſelves, and try the copies, they can have no ſure hiſtorical notice what the Fathers held, except by the common conſent of credible Reporters or Hiſtorians: Not while one ſide ſaith, they ſay this; and the other ſide ſaith, they ſay the contrary, and yet their Books are to be ſeen by all. We may bid them *believe us*, and the Papiſts may bid them *believe them*; and a Prieſt may cheat them, by ſaying that his word is the Churches. But though this will produce a humane belief in the hearers or readers, as by advantages it is moſt taking with them, yet that fallible belief is all the certainty that it can afford them. Therefore I think it moſt ingenuous and reaſonable, to give men ſuch arguments as they are capable of underſtanding, and improving to certain ſatisfaction.

2. Becauſe they that can ſtudy ſuch Authors as have gathered the Sentences of the

An-

Ancients in this controverſie, may find it ſo fully done by *Edmund. Albertinus* in his ſecond Book, that they can need no more.

P. You know that *Albertinus* is anſwered.

R. And I know that he is again defended: and who doubteth but you can anſwer me copiouſly, if I did maintain that the Sun giveth light: What is it that a man cannot talk for, eſpecially they that can hope to perſwade all the Chriſtian world that they muſt be damned, unleſs they will believe that all mens ſenſes are deceived, and that God is the great deceiver of the world?

P. But how can you think to pleaſe God and be ſaved, if you be not of the ſame faith as the Church hath always been of? All the ancient Fathers and Catholick Church were for Tranſubſtantiation; and are you wiſer and in a ſafer way then they?

R. You have loſt your credit with me ſo far, as that your word is no oracle to me: If I muſt not believe my *own nor other mens ſenſes*, I am not bound to believe you, at leaſt when I know you ſpeak falſly. But I pray, tell me, how know you that the Church and Fathers did ſo believe?

P Becauſe the preſent Church ſaith ſo, which cannot err.

R. Do not your own Writers ſay, that a General Council and Pope may err in matter of

of fact, and that they did ſo in condemning Pope *Honorius*, and in other caſes?

P. Yes: but this is a matter of faith.

R. Is it not a matter of fact what this or that man ſaid, and what doctrine the Church at ſuch a time did teach and hold? But how know you that the preſent Church doth ſay ſo, that this was the faith of the ancient Church?

P. By their teſtimony in a General Council.

R. Did you hear the Council ſay ſo?

P. No: but the Church telleth me that the Council ſaid ſo.

R. Who is it that you now call the Church which tells you ſo?

P. My ſuperiors, who have it from the Pope, and their fathers.

R. Are your ſuperiors that told you ſo, the Church? Or is the Pope the Church? If ſo, what need you ſay, a Council is the Church? And how know you that the Pope and your ſuperiors err not in a matter of fact?

P. I know it by the Decrees of the Council yet extant.

R. 1. But if *ſenſe* be deceitful, how know you that you ever read ſuch Decrees? 2. How know you that they are not forgeries, or ſince corrupted?

P. The Church is a ſafe keeper of its own Records.

R. Still

R. Still what mean you by your Church? The vulgar neither keep nor underſtand your Councils. The Council of *Trent* is long ceaſed: No other General Council hath been ſince, to tell you what are the true Decrees of that Council. The Pope is not the Church, and he may err in a matter of fact; what then is the Church that tells you certainly what the Council of *Trent* decreed? Tell me if you can?

P. We have ſuch common hiſtorical evidence and tradition, as you have for your Acts of Parliament when the Parliament is ended. The preſent Governors preſerve them.

R. Very good: It is the office of the Governors to take that care, but therein they are not indefectible and infallible; but *they* and the *publiſhed Laws*, and the *notice of the whole Land*, and the *judicial proceedings* by them in the *Courts of Judicature*, make up a *certain hiſtorical evidence*. And ſo it may be in your caſe: And when you have talkt your utmoſt, you can ſhow no more. And have not we the ſame Writings of Fathers and Councils as you have? You dare not deny it. Why then may not we know what is in them, as well as you? And, I pray you, tell me, whether your Antiquaries, ſuch as *Albaſpinæus*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, *Petavius*, *Simonsdus*, &c. do prove what *Cyprian*, *Optatus*, *Augu-*

Auguſtin, &c. held, by the judgement of the Pope or Councils, or by citing the words of the Authors themſelves? And do *Crab*, *Binnius*, *Surius*, *Caranza*, &c. prove what one Council ſaid by the authority of another, or by the Records themſelves, yet viſible to all?

P. Thoſe Records themſelves, even the viſible Writings of the Fathers and Councils, are for Tranſubſtantiation.

R. Till you have perſwaded me out of my ſenſes, I will not believe you. I pray you, tell me if you can, of any Author or Council that ever uſed the name [*Tranſubſtantiation*] before *Stephanus Æduenſis*, after the year 1100. *de Sacram. altar c.* 13.

P. Though the name be new, the doctrine is not.

R. Tell me next, what *General Council* did ever determine it, before the Council of *Lateran* under *Innoc.* 3. *an.* 1215.

P. Not expreſly: for General Councils need not mention it, till the *Albigenſes* hereticks gave them occaſion by denying it.

R. Was it an article of faith before? If it were, either the Councils are not the meaſure of your faith, or it is very mutable.

P. Among all your queſtionings, anſwer me this queſtion if you can. If that General Council decreed Tranſubſtantiation, what could move them ſo to do, if it were not the faith

faith of the Church before? Were they not all of the ſame mind the day before they did it; and ſo the day before that, and the day before that? &c. Or do you think that they were againſt Tranſubſtantiation the night before, and awaked all of another mind the next morning? What could make all the Paſtors of the Church think that this was the true faith, if they did not think it was the ancient faith? And what could make them think it the ancient faith, if it were not ſo? Did not they know what their fathers held? And did not their fathers know what their fathers held? The ſame I ſay of the Council of *Trent* alſo.

R. Thus men that muſt not believe the common ſenſe of mankind, can believe the dreaming conjectures of their brains, and ſit in a corner, and thence tell the world what can and what cannot be done by publick Aſſemblies, at many hundred years and miles diſtance. Who would not laugh at a Fryer, that in his cell would tell by moral conjectures, all the thoughts & motions of an army, or navy, that never ſaw them, and contrary to the experience of thoſe that were on the ground and intereſſed in their counſels and actions. Obſerve how many falſe ſuppoſitions go to make up your cheats.

1. You ſuppoſe that is rue *General Council*, which

which is a pack of factious Prelats ſubject to the Pope, and aſſembled at *Rome* in his own Palace, under the aw of his preſence and power. And as if the ſmal number after at *Trent* had ſpoken the minds of all the Churches.

2. You ſuppoſe *all the members of a Council to be of one mind*, when as they determine by the *major vote*: and ofttimes the difference is not above *two or three*, and it is poſſible one voice may turn the ſcales; and perhaps one or two, or ten, may be abſent one day, and preſent another, and ſo the cry of [*The Judgement of all the Biſhops in the world*] may ſignifie no more, but that *two or three* of the other ſide ſtayd a little too long at dinner that day, while the other party carried it by their abſence. And, I pray you, where hath God promiſed, that the faith of an hundred and one ſhal not fail, when the faith of ninety-nine of the ſame company may fail, ſuppoſing the Council to be two hundred? Or why are the one hundred and one the Biſhops of all the world, and not the ninety-nine?

3. Do you think we never read the Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, and before them, of the Councils of *Ariminum*, *Eph.* 2. yea, *Calcedon*? &c. And yet muſt we ſuppoſe that men come thither all of one mind, when they have ſuch ſhameful contentions, ſuch cunning contrivances to get the majority of votes, ſuch

aw and terror from the power of the Chief, and ſuch carnal dependances and reſpects to their ſeveral worldly intereſts? Yea, ſometimes fighting it out unto blood, as *Dioſcorus* and *Flavianus* caſe doth ſhamefully evince?

4. And muſt we ſuppoſe mens minds to be *changed in their ſleep*, when the *aw* or the *oratory* of other men change them? Do we not know the courſe of the *Parliaments* of *England* of later times, how much a few men of more then ordinary parts and intereſt, can do with the reſt; and how oft the major vote hath gone againſt the ſenſe of the far greater number of the Houſe?

5. And do we not know, that ordinarily he that is ſent to the Council from a Province, is choſen as it pleaſeth the Pope, the King, or the Archbiſhop, or ſome in greateſt power, and rarely according to the free-will and ſenſe of the greater part of the Clergy. If five hundred to one of the Clergy of a Kingdom be of one mind, and the Prince, or chief men, or powerfulleſt Prelates be of another, they will ſend a Biſhop thither of their own mind.

6. Do you think we know not that all the the Papiſts are not paſt the third or fourth part of the Chriſtian world, Why then ſhould their ſence be called the ſenſe of all the Chriſtian world?

7. Do

7. Do you think we know not how little reaſon you have to ſay, that the Council at *Laterane* ſpake the ſenſe of all the Church, when the Decrees were but propoſed by Pope *Innocent*, and recited there without any due Synodical deliberation, and ſome liked them, and ſome diſliked them? as you may find in *Math. Paris* in *K. John*, *Nauclerus Gener.* 41. *ad an.* 1215. *Godefridus ad an.* 1215. *Platina in Vita Innoc.* 3. And this one of your late falſe Scriblers in a Book for Toleration alſo ſaith; Though the Diſputers againſt Dr. *Cunning* and Dr. *Pierſon* copiouſly and confidently juſtifie that Council: and indeed with you it paſſeth for an approved one.

8. And were not your arguing as ſtrong for the Counſil of *Epheſ.* 2. and that at *Arim.* and *Sirmium*, and divers at *Conſtantinople* diſallowed, and thoſe at *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, (where were many times the number of the Council at *Trent*) did theſe Councils all go to bed of one mind, and riſe of another? Or did they not know what their Fathers faith was? Why then do you reprobate them, and deny that which they decreed as of faith? Is it not a ſhame, to talk of *the Biſhops of all the world*, and *Tradition from their Fathers*, when your meaning is but that *all theſe may err* and do *oft err*, unleſs *one man*, the *Pope* approve them? But where *ſenſe* is renounced, we muſt not exPect *modeſty*. P.

P. But the ancient Councils and Fathers are againſt you, as is to be ſeen.

R. It is utterly falſe: I will not abuſe the Reader ſo as to carry him into a wood, and loſe him among a multitude of old Books, when he hath more ſatisfactory evidence enough at hand.

But, I As to all your Citations from true antiquity (for your forged Authors and corrupted teſtimonies we regard not) they are anſwered by this one true obſervation, that when old Writers ſometimes ſay, that after conſecration it is *No more bread and wine, but the body and blood of Chriſt*, their whole context plainly ſhoweth, that they mean that it is no more *MEER* or *common bread* and *wine*; &c. uſually they ſo ſpeak. Becauſe *forma denominat*, & it is the *ultimate from* that denominateth, all antecedents forms being but the *diſpoſitio materiæ*. As if the queſtion be, *whether a ſhilling be ſilver or money?* Before the coining, it it was but *ſilver*; but after, it is no more *common ſilver*, but *money: Silver* is but the *matter*, and not the denominating form. Is your garment to be called *cloth* or a *cloak?* Before the making it was but *cloth*, but now it is not meer *cloth*, but a *cloak*. The ſame I may ſay of the Kings crown and ſcepter, or of any *relative*, *repreſentative* or *perſonating form* that is added to any matter or man. This is the plain

plain meaning of the Ancients.

II. And as to what they ſay againſt you, I will now only give you a few brief inſtances.

1. *Juſtin Martyr, in Dial. cum Tryph.* ſaith, *The offering of flower delivered to be offered for them that were cleanſed of the leproſie, was a type of the* BREAD *of the Euchariſt which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt commanded us to make in remembrance of his paſſion,* &c.

And more plainly *Apolog.* 2. (indeed the firſt) *When the Preſident hath given thanks, and all the people acclaimed, thoſe that with us are called Deacons, diſtribute to every one preſent* BREAD *and* WINE *and Water, and bring them to thoſe that are abſent.*

2. *Irenæus* ſaith, *lib.* 4. *c.* 34. *For as the bread which is of the earth receiving the divine invocation, is not now common bread? but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things, the Terrene and the celeſtial,* &c.

See more out of him in *Albertinus*, at large.

3. *Tertullian cont. Marcion l.* 3. c. 19. *Calling Bread his body, that hence you may underſtand that he gave to bread the figure of his body.*

And before *l.* 1. *He reprobated not* &c. *Bread, by which he repreſenteth his very body.*

And *lib.* 4. *cap.* 40. *The Bread which he took and diſtributed to his Diſciples he made his body, ſaying, This is my body; that is, the figure of my*

body, &c. *And what he would have bread then ſignifie, he ſufficiently declared, calling bread his body.*

And it is a noble paſſage of *Tertullians* againſt the Academicks that queſtioned ſenſe, *lib. de anim.* c. 17. *What doſt thou, O procacious Academick? Thou overthroweſt the whole ſtate of life: Thou diſturbeſt the whole order of nature: Thou blindeſt the providence of God himſelf, as if he had made mens lying and deceitful ſenſes to be the Lords, in underſtanding, honoring, diſpenſing and enjoying all his works: Is not the whole Condition (of man) ſubadminiſtred by theſe.* And after, *We may not call thoſe ſenſes into queſtion, leſt Chriſt himſelf muſt deliberate of their certainty* (or muſt diſtruſt them.) *Leſt it may be ſaid, that he falſly ſaw Satan caſt down from heaven, or falſly heard the voyce of his Father teſtifying of him; or was deceived when he touched* Peters *wives mother*, &c. *or perceived not a true taſte of the wine which he conſecrated in the memorial of his blood.* Many ſuch places are in *Tertullian.*

4. *Origen* is large and plain to the ſame purpoſe in *Matth.* 15. calling it, *bread* and a *typical and ſymbolical body, which profiteth none but the worthy receivers, and that according to the proportion of their faith, and which no wicked man doth eat*, &c. Many more ſuch places *Albertinus* vindicateth.

5. *Cyprians*

5. *Cyprians* Epiſtle to *Magnus* is too large this way to be recited. As, *Even the ſacrifices of the Lord declare the Chriſtian vnanimity, connexed by firm and inſeparable love: For when the Lord calleth bread his body (or his body bread) made up of many united grains,* &c. *And when he calleth the wine his blood,* &c. So *Epiſt. ad Cæcil.*

6 *Euſebius Cæſar. demonſt. Evang. l.* 1 c. 10. *Celebrating dayly the memorial of the body and blood of Chriſt,* &c. *Seeing then we receive the memorial of this Sacrifice to be perfected on the table, by the ſymbols of his body and moſt precious blood* &c. And *l. He delivered to us to uſe, bread as the ſymbol of his own body.*

7. *Athanaſius* words are recited by *Albertinus, l.* 2 *p.* 400. 401. &c.

8. *Baſil. de Spir. Sanct.* ſaith, *Which of the Saints hath left us in writing the words of invocation, when the bread of the Euchariſt, and the cup of bleſſing are ſhewed?*

9. *Ephrem in Bibl. Photii, p.* 415. *Edit. Aug.* ſaith, *The body of Chriſt, which believers receive, ſeeth not his ſenſible ſubſtance, and is not ſeparated from the intelligible grace.*

And *ad eos qui filii Dei,* &c. *Take notice diligently how taking bread in his hands, he bleſſed it, and brake it, for a figure of his immaculate body, and he bleſſed the cup and gave it to his Diſciples, as a figure of his precious blood.*

10. *Cyrillus, vel Joan. Hieroſol. Catech. Myſtag.* call the *bread* indeed *Chriſts body*, but fully expounds himſelf *de Chryſmate, Cat.* 3. *pag.* 235. *For as the bread of the Euchariſt, after the invocation of the holy Ghoſt, is no more common bread, but is the body of Chriſt: So alſo this holy ointment is no more meer ointment, nor (if any one had rather ſo ſpeake) common, now it is conſecrated; but it is a gift (*or Grace*) which cauſeth the preſence of Chriſt and the holy Ghoſt; that is, of his Divinity.* As the *ointment* is Grace, or the *holy Ghoſt*, juſt ſo the *bread* is the *body of Chriſt*, as he ſaith after *Cat.* 4. It is not only what we ſee (Bread and Wine) but more.

11. *Hierom cont. Jovinian. l.* 2. *The Lord as a type, or figur of his blood, offered not water but wine.*

12. *Ambroſe de Sacram. l.* 4. *c.*4. *This therefore we aſſert, how that which is bread, can yet be the body of Chriſt,* &c. And, *If Chriſts ſpeech had ſo much force, that it made that begin to be which was not, how much more is it operative, that the things that were both be, and be changed into ſomething elſe?* And, *As thou haſt drunk the ſimilitude of death, ſo thou drinkeſt the ſimilitude of precious blood.*

13. *Theodoret in Dialog. immuab.* dealeth with an Eutychian Heritick, who defended his Error by pleading that the *bread* in the Euchariſt

Euchariſt was changed into the body of Chriſt: To whom ſaith *Theodoret*, *The Lord who hath called that meat and bread which is naturally his body, and who again called himſelf a vine, did honor the viſible ſigns with the appellation of his body and blood; not having changed their nature, but added grace to nature,*

And in *Dialog. 2. in contuſe*, he ſaith, *The divine myſteries are ſigns of the true body.* And again, anſwering the Eutychians pretence of a change, he ſaith, *By the net which thou haſt made, art thou taken.* Note. *For even after the conſecration, the myſtical ſigns change not their nature: For they remain in all their firſt* SUBSTANCE, *figure and form, and are viſible, and to be Handled as before. But they are underſtood to be the things which they were made, and are believed and venerated as made that which they are believed to be.* Would you have plainer words?

14 *Gelaſius cont. Neſt. and Eutych.* ſaith, *Verily the Sacraments of the body and blood of Chriſt which we take, is a divine thing, for which and by which we are made partakers of the divine Nature.* Note. *And yet it ceaſeth not to be the ſubſtance and nature of bread and wine. And certainly the Image and ſimilitude of the body and blood of Chriſt are celebrated in the action of the myſteries.* What can be plainer?

15. *Cyril. Alexandr. in John 4. cap. 14.*

ſaith, *He gave to his believing diſciples fragments of bread, ſaying, Take, eat, this is my body.*

16 *Facundus lib. 9. cap. 5. pag* 404. (as cited by P. *Molin. de Novitate Papiſmi*) *call that the body and blood of Chriſt which is the Sacrament of his body, in the conſecrated bread and cup.* Note. *Not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood; but becauſe they contain the myſterye of his body and blood.*

But I am ſo weary of theſe needleſs tranſcriptions, that I will trouble my ſelf and the Reader with no more. *Albertinus* will give him enow more who deſireth them: And no doubt but with a wet finger they can blot out all theſe, and teach us to deny the *ſenſe of words*, as well as our ſenſes.

D. But you ſaid alſo, that the *preſent Church and its tradition, is againſt Tranſubſtantiation, as well as the ancient:* How prove you that?

R. Juſt as I prove that the Proteſtants are againſt it.

By the *preſent Church*, I mean the far greater part of all the Chriſtians in the world. The *Greeks* with the *Muſcovites*, the *Armenians*, the *Syrians*, the *Copties*, the *Abaſſines*, and the *Proteſtants*, and all the reſt who make up about twice or thrice as many as the Papiſts.

That they hold that there is *true bread and wine after conſecration*, all impartial Hiſtorians teſtifie,

teſtifie, both Papiſts and Proteſtants, and their own ſeveral Countrey-men; and alſo travellers who have been among them. And their Lyturgies, even thoſe that are in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, put out by themſelves, do teſtifie for thoſe Countreys where they are uſed (though as Biſhops *Usher* hath detected) by one words addition, they have ſhamefully endeavored to corrupt the Ethiopick Liturgy about the *real preſence*.) But I need no more proof of that which no faithful Hiſtory doth deny. And then I need not prove that Tranſubſtantiation is againſt the moſt general or common tradition. For all theſe Chriſtians, the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Abaſſines* &c, profeſs to follow the Religion which they have received from their Anceſtors, as well as the Papiſts do: And if the Papiſts be to be believed, in ſaying that this is the *Religion* which they received from their forefathers, why are not the other to be believed in the ſame caſe? And if the Popiſh tradition ſeem regardable to them, why ſhould not the tradition of twice or thrice as many Chriſtians be more regardable? And if in *Councils*, the major vote muſt carry it, why not the Judgement and tradition of the real body of Chriſts Church? As for their trick of excepting againſt them as Schiſmaticks and Heriticks, to invalidate their votes and Judgement,

we deſpiſe it, as knowing that ſo any uſurper that would make himſelf the ſole Judge, may ſay by all the reſt of the world : But as they Judge of others, they are juſtly judged by others themſelves.

CHAP. X.

The ſecond part of the Controverſy, Whether it be Chriſts very fleſh and blood into which the bread and wine are tranſubſtantiated ?

R. OUr firſt Queſtion was, *Whether be any bread and wine left after Conſecration?* Our ſecond is, *Whether Chriſts real fleſh and blood be there, as that into which the bread and wine are changed?*

And herein, 1. I do freely grant? that the change of Chriſts body by glorification is ſo great, as that it may be called, though not a Spirit, yet a *ſpiritual body*, as *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 15. ſaith, *ours* when glorified ſhal be; that is, a body very like in purity, ſimplicity. and activity to a ſpirit: And the general difference between a ſpirit and body, was not held by many of the *Greek* Fathers as it is by us: And if the ſecond council of *Nice* was infallible, no Angel or other creature is *incorporeal*: Or as *Damaſus* ſaith they are corporeal in reſpect to God, but incorporeal in reſpect to groſs bodies. The perfect knowledge of the difference

ference between *corpus* and *ſpiritus*, except by the *formal vertues*, is unknown to mortal men

2. I grant therefore, that our ſenſes are no competent Judges *Whether Chriſts true body be in the Sacrament?* no more then whether an Angel be in this room? There are bodies which are inviſible.

3. I grant that it is unknow to us, how far Chriſts glorified body may extend? Whether the ſame may by both in heaven and on earth? I am not able nor willing to confute them that ſay, *Light* is a *body*; nor them that ſay, It is a *ſpirit*: nor them that ſay, It is *quid medium*, as a *nexus* of both: I mean *Æther* or *ignis*, viſible in its light. And it is an incomprehenſible wonder, if *lumen* be a real *radiant* or *emanant* part of the Sun, that it ſhould indiviſibly fill all the ſpace thence to this earth, and how much further little do we know. So for the extentions of Chriſts body, let thoſe that underſtand it diſpute for me.

4. And I will grant that it is very probable that as in heaven we ſhall have both a *Soul* and *body*, ſo the *body* is not like to have ſo near an *intuition* and *fruition* of God as the *ſoul*. And whether the glorified *body* of *Chriſt* will not be there a *medium* of Gods communication of glory to our *bodies*, yea and his *glorified ſoul* to our *ſouls*, as the Sun is now to our eyes, I do

do not well understand: only I know that it is his prayer and will that *we be with him where he is to behold his Glory*; and that *God and the Lamb will be the light of the heavenly* Jerusalem.

5. And I am fully satisfied that it is not the sings only, but the *real body and blood* of Christ, which are given us in the Sacraments (both Baptism and the Eucharist) But *how given us? Relatively, de jure*; as a man is given to a woman in marriage; or as a house and land are delivered to me, to be mine for my use; though I touch them not Thus 1. A *right* to *Christ* is given us? 2. And the *fruits* or *benefits* of his *crucified body* and shed blood, are *actually* given us, that is, *Pardon* and the *Spirit*, merited for us thereby.

6. And among the benefits given us, besides the Relative, there are some such as we call *Real* or *Physical terminative ly*, and *hyperphysical originally ut a Causa*, which are the *Spirit of holiness* or the *Quickening*, *Illumminating* and *Sanctifying* influence of the spirit of Christ upon our souls. And the Sacrament is appointed as a special means of communicating this.

7. I have met with some of late who say, that Indeed Christs body and blood in his humbled state, were not really eaten & drunk by the disciples, at his last supper: For the *flesh* profiteth not to such a *use*: But that his

Glorified

Glorified Body is *ſpiritual*, and is extenſively communicated and inviſibly preſent under the form of Bread in the Sacrament; and that as we have a *Body*, a *ſenſitive life*, and an *intellectual ſoul*, ſo Chriſt is the life of all theſe reſpectively; *viz.* His *Body* is made the *ſpiritual nouriſhment of our bodies*; his *ſenſitive ſoul* (for which the word *Blood* is put, becauſe it is in the blood in animals) is the food or life of our ſenſitive ſouls; and his intellectual ſoul of ours: And to theſe uſes they aſſert the *Real preſence*, and *oral* participation of Chriſts glorified body.

To all which I ſay, 1 Whether or how far an inviſible ſpiritual Body is preſent, ſenſe is no judge, nor can we know any further then Gods Word telleth us. 2. That Chriſt in his glorified *Soul* and *Body* is our Interceſſour with God, through whom we have all things, we muſt not doubt. 3. That Chriſt in his humane and divine Nature now in Heaven, is that Teacher who hath left us a certain word, and that King who hath left us a perfect Law of Life, whom we muſt obey, and a promiſe which we muſt truſt, we muſt not queſtion. 4 That the Holy Ghoſt who is our ſpiritual Life, is given us *by*, *from* and *for* Chriſt our Mediator, we muſt take for certain truth.

But, though in all theſe reſpects, Faith apprehen-

prehendeth and liveth upon Christ, yet that moreover his glorified Body in substance, either feedeth, or by contact purifieth our bodies, and his sensitive soul, our sensitive souls, and his intellectual soul, our intellectual souls, as if in themselves, and not in their effects only they were thus communicated to us, I understand not, either by any just conception of the thing it self, or any proof of it from the Word of God. But if any can help me to see it, I shall not refuse instruction.

Nor can I see why the Soul of Christ should be said to be given in the *Wine only*, and not in the *Bread*; Nor why by this kind of Communication he may not as truly be said to be given us in other Ordinances as in the Eucharist; Nor know I what they mean by the *forms* of *Bread* and *Wine*, under which they say that Christs Body and Blood is given: But I am past doubt, that Bread and Wine are still really in substance there.

And whereas the same men say; that it is Christs humbled Flesh and blood as sacrificed on the Cross that is commemorated, but his glorified Body and Soul only which are communicated and received, I must say, 1. That Christ plainly tells us of his *giving us his sacrificed Body* or *Flesh* it self to eat, as he is the *Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the World*;

World: And he ſaith, *Take, Eat, this is my Body which is broken for you*, &c. ſo that the ſame Body is commemorated and communicated: But *how Communicated?* In the *effects* of his ſacrifice: His *Body* was given a *Sacrifice* to God *for us*, and the *fruits* of that ſacrifice *given to us*. And thus he was given a ſacrifice for the *life of the World*; And thus we do receive him: By our bodily taking and eating the Bread, we profeſs that our ſouls take him to be our Saviour and Cauſe of our Life, both as *Purchaſing* and *Meriting* it on Earth, and *Interceeding* and *Communicating* it in and from Heaven.

2. And this Doctrine will not ſerve the Papiſts turn, who tell us that *Bread* and *Wine* are ceaſed, and that Chriſts very Fleſh and Blood is there, into which all the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine are turned? and that his natural Body before his death, was in the ſame ſort given under the forms of Bread and Wine as now; and will not be beholden to this ſubterfuge.

And indeed it is ſtrange, if the Sacrament at the *firſt Inſtitution* ſhould be *one thing*, and ever after another thing; and that the Bread ſhould ever ſince be turned into *Chriſts Body*, upon the Prieſts Conſecration, and not be turned into it, (becauſe not yet glorified) upon his own words, *This is my Body*. Therefore

fore we muſt let this go, and ſpeak of what they own and hold indeed.

And as for any other bodily preſence, influence or communication of Chriſts Body or Soul, beſides that which they call Tranſubſtantiation, we have nothing to do with it in this Controverſie.

That the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is not turned into the ſubſtance of the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, is proved.

I. Becauſe the glorified Body of Chriſt is not formally and properly Fleſh and Blood: Though it be the ſame Body which was fleſh and blood. The Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, 1 Cor. 15 50. 51. *Now this I ſay, brethren, that fleſh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, nor doth corruption inherit incorruption; Behold, I ſhow you a myſtery: We ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.* It is not only Dr. *Hammond*, but other of the beſt expoſitors who ſhew that by Fleſh and Blood and corruption, here is not meant *ſin*, but *fleſh* and *blood formally conſidered*; which is ever corruptible: And the Papiſts commonly confeſs this. If therefore it be Fleſh and Blood which the Bread and Wine are turned into, then either Chriſt hath two bodies, or two parts of one, which are utterly heterogeneal, one Fleſh and Blood, and the other not; one corruptible, and the other incorruptible.

II. And

II. And this feigneth Chriſt to be often incarnate, even thouſands and millions of times; And to lay down that incarnate Body again as oft as it corrupteth, and to take up a new one as oft as the Prieſt pleaſe; and yet all but one. Whereas the Church and Scripture have ever told us but of *one Incarnation* of Jeſus Chriſt.

III. And it is expreſly contrary to his promiſe, Joh. 6. 51. 'I am the living Bread 'which came down from Heaven: If any 'man eat of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever: 'And the Bread which I give is my Fleſh, 'which I will give for the life of the World. 'verſ 34. Who ſo eateth my Fleſh and drin-'keth my Blood hath eternal life. He that 'eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, 'dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living 'Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Fa-'ther, ſo he that eateth me, even he ſhall live 'by me. He that eateth of this Bread ſhall 'live for ever. Theſe are the expreſs pro-'miſes of Chriſt. But the Papiſts ſay, that *wicked men & unbelievers eat the fleſh of Chriſt*, who ſhall not *live for ever*, nor have *eternal life*, nor *dwell* in *Chriſt*, but are more miſera-ble by their hypocriſie.

I paſs by abundance of other Arguments, becauſe commonly uſed, and theſe are as many as my ends require; and I would

would make the Reader no more work then needs.

CHAP. XI.

The Concluſion of the firſt Book: The Cauſes of Popery.

R. I Have now made plain to you. 1. *What the Proteſtants Religion is*, (or at leaſt *my own*, and all that I perſwade you or any other to embrace. 2. And alſo that it is granted to be all true by the generality of the Papiſts (as is explained and proved.) 3. And I have told you, by an enumeration of ſome particulars, why I am not a Papiſt, and why I diſſwade you from it. 4. And I have made good my firſt *charge*, in the point of Tranſubſtantiation, if any thing in the World can be proved. The ſecond I ſhall leave till another time, *viz.* To ſhow you how far their Religion (as Popiſh) is from infallible certainty; and what horrid confuſion is among them; and how they have done much to promote infidelity in the World, by building Religion upon ſome notorious untruths, and upon a multitude of utter uncertainties. Though I doubt not, but among them there are many true Chriſtians, who practically reſolve their faith into the ſurer evidences of Divine Revelation; yet I ſhall clearly

clearly prove to you, that all thoſe whoſe practical faith is no ſurer or better, then the notional opinions of their Divines will allow, have no certain Faith or Religion at all: And what impudency is it to make men believe, that there is no *certainty* of Religion to be had, but in their way, who build their Religion upon ſuch a multitude of *uncertainties* and certain falſhoods, as will amaze you when I come to open them to you, *viz.* that ever ſo many learned men, and perſons of all ranks, can be induced ſo to jeſt in the matters of their ſalvation.

And if I be not by death, or other greater work prevented, I hope in order to make good all the reſt of the charges before mentioned, which are our Reaſons againſt the Popiſh way of Religion. In the mean time, tell me what you think of that which is already ſaid.

D. I know not how to confute what you have ſaid: And yet when I hear them on the other ſide, me thinks their tale ſeems fair, and I cannot anſwer them neither: ſo that between you both, we that are unlearned are in a ſad caſe, who muſt thus be toſt up and down by the diſputations of diſagreeing Prieſts, ſo that we know not what a man may ſay is certain.

R. To this I have ſeveral things to ſay;

1. *Or-*

1. *Ordination* doth not make men *wise*, *holy*, *humble* and *self-denying*; but sets such men apart for the sacred office, who seek it, and have tolerable gifts of utterance: And it is too ordinary for worldly minded men, to make a worldly trade of the Priest-hood, meerly for *ease*, and *wealth*, and *honour*. In which case, do you not think that the Papists who have multitudes of rich benefices, prelacies, preferments, and Church-power, and worldly honour, are liker to be drawn by worldly interest, then such as I that am exceeding glad and thankful, if I might but preach for nothing?

2. Do you lay your faith and salvation upon plausible discourses? and will you be of that mans faith, whom you cannot confute? Then you must be of *every mans* faith: or indeed of *no mans*. There are none of all these Sects, so hardly confuted, as a *Porphyry*, a *Julian*, or such like Infidels who dispute against *Christ*, and the *truth of the Scriptures*? or such Sadducees as dispute against the *immortality of the soul*. Alace, the tattle of Papists, Pelagians, Antinomians, Separatists, Quakers, and all such, supposing the truth of the *souls immortality* and the *Scriptures*, is easily resisted and confuted, in comparison of their assaults who deny these our foundations. And will you turn Sadducee, Atheist or Infidel, because you

you cannot confute their Sophiſtry? I tell you, if you knew how much harder it is, to deal with one of theſe then with a Papiſt, or any other Sectary, you would ſhake the head, to hear one man diſpute for an univerſal Monarch, and another diſpute againſt a form of prayer, and another whether it be lawful to Communicate with diſſenters, &c. while ſo few of them all can defend their foundations, even the *ſouls Immortality* and the *Scriptures*, nor confute a ſubtile Infidel or Sadducee.

3. What if we *all agreed* to ſay that there is no Bread in the Sacrament after Conſecration? Were it ever the truer for that? Will you be deceived as oft as men can but *agree* to deceive you? There is a far greater party agreed againſt Jeſus Chriſt (even five parts of the World) then that which is agreed for him: Will you therefore be againſt Chriſt too? There are more agreed for *Mahomet* (a groſs upſtart deceiver) then are agreed for Chriſt: And doth that make it certain that they are in the right?

4. Will you deny all your ſenſes, and the ſenſes of all the World, as oft as you cannot anſwer him that denyeth them? Upon theſe terms, what end will there be of any Controverſie, or what evidence ſhall ever ſatisfie man? Have Papiſts any ſurer and more ſatisfying evidence for you, then ſenſe?

I pray

I pray you tell me; Did you ever meet with any of them that doubt of *another life*, or of the *immortality* of the ſoul?

D. Yes, many a one: I would we were all more certain then we are.

R. And what is it that ſuch men would have to put them out of doubt?

D. They ſay that our talk of Prophets and ſupernatural revelation are all uncertainties; and if they could *ſee*, they would believe. Could they *ſee* ſuch *Miracles* as they read of: Had they ſeen *Lazarus* raiſed, or Chriſt riſen from the dead, &c. Had they ſeen Angels or Devils, or Spirits appearing: Had they ſeen Heaven or Hell, they would believe.

R. And are not you more obſtinate then they, if you will not believe that there is any *Bread* and *Wine*, when you *ſee*, *feel*, *ſmell*, and *taſte* it, and all men that have ſenſes are of the ſame mind? What is left to ſatisfie you, if you give ſo little credit to the common ſenſe of all the World?

D. But I oft think that the *faith* of all *the Church* is much ſurer then my ſenſe, or my private faith: At leaſt it is ſafeſt to venture in the common road, and to ſpeed as the Church ſpeedeth, which Chriſt died for, and is his Spouſe.

R. 1. But do you think that the opinion of the Papal faction, who are not the third part of

of the Universal Church, that is, the Christian World, is the *faith of all the Church*? Why call you *Opinion faith?* and a Sect and faction, *All the Church?*

2. Indeed, if all the Church did set their *senses* against mine, I would rather believe them then my senses: For I should think, that I were in that point distracted, or my senses by some disease perverted, which I did not perceive: I mean if it were in a case where they had the affirmative: As if all *England* should witness that they saw it light at midnight, I would think my eyes had some impediment which I knew not of, if I saw none. But this is not your case; The Papists themselves do not set all their *senses* against yours: much less the senses of all mankind: They do not say, that [*We and all men, except the Protestants, do see, and feel, and taste that there is no* Bread *and Wine.*] But contrarily, You have *the senses of all the World*, and the *faith* of two or three parts of the Christian World, against the opinion of one Sect, which Schismatically call themselves all the Church.

D. But suppose that they err in this one point, they may for all that be in the right in all the rest: Who is it that hath no error? I must not for this one forsake them.

R. 1. I will stand to their *own judgements*

in this, Whether all their foundation and faith be not uncertain, if any one Article of their faith prove false? They all (that ever I knew) agreed of the affirmative: And will give you no thanks for such a defence.

1. And if we come to that work, I shall prove all the rest of their opinions before mentioned to be also false.

D. What then if I find but one point false in the Protestants Religion? Must I therefore forsake it all as false?

R. 1. Still remember to distinguish between our *Objective* and our *Subjective faith*: or if you understand not those words, between *Gods Revelation* & *Mans Belief* of it: or the divine *Rule* and *Matter* of our faith, & our *faith* it self. And about our own *Belief* you must distinguish between a mans *Profession* of *Belief*, and the *Reality* of his belief.

All true Protestants *profess* to take Gods Word alone, or his Revelation in *Nature* and *Scripture*, for the whole *Matter* of their Divine Belief and Religion. But who it is that *sincerely believeth* little do I know: nor how much of this *word* any singular person understandeth, and believeth, I can give you no account of. If *personal faith* were that which we dispute of, I would be accountable for no mans but mine own. In this sense, There are are as many *Faiths* and *Religions* as *men*:

For

For every man hath his *own Faith* and *Religion*: And if you know that a man erreth in one point, it followeth not that he erreth in another. They that believed that the *resurrection is past*, believed a falſhood: and yet truly believed that *Chriſt was the Meſſiah*: They erred that thought it lawful *to eat things offered to Idols*; and yet they erred not in *believing in Chriſt*. No two men in the World, its like, have the ſame degree of perſonal faith and knowledge, as I oft ſaid before. But if our profeſſed *object of faith*, that is, Gods Word, were falſe in *one thing*, we could not be ſure that it were true in any thing.

Yet here I told you before, 1. That a man may be much ſurer that *one part* of Scripture is *Gods Word*, then *another*; becauſe ſome *Copies* are doubtful in the diverſe Readings of ſome particular *words* or *ſentences*; and which of them that ſo differ is Gods Word, we oft know not: But ſo much as we are ſure is the Word of God, we are ſure is true: So if the Authority of ſome few books was once doubted of. (as 2 *Pet. Jam. Jud. Heb. &c.*) and yet be by any, it followeth not that they doubt of the truth of any, which they know to be the Word of God. 2. Or if any do hold that the Pen-men might be left to their natural fallibility in ſome by-hiſtorical circumſtances or words, it would

not follow, that *one Article* or the *Gospel* or *Christian faith* is doubtful, which is plainly as the Kernel of it, delivered in all the Scripture, and also by infallible Universal Tradition, by *it self*, in the *Sacrament*, *Creed*, *Lords Prayer* and *Decalogue*.

And our case also much differeth from the Papists in this: For we profess that our *objective faith* (Gods Word) is *infallible*, and we are *infallible* so far as we *believe it*: But we confess that we are lyable to *misunderstand* some parts of it; and so far are fallible, as being imperfect: But the Papists say, that their *Pope* and *Councils*, and Universal-*Practisers* are personally *infallible*, so as not to be lyable to any misunderstanding of any Article of faith (say some) or Article of *Catholick faith* (say others:) And so they make their own Act of *Believing* to be Commensurate, and equally certain with *Gods Word of faith*; and therefore they allow you to question them in all, if they err in one, as pretending to a gift of never erring in any.

D. But is it not a great reason to incline us to them rather then to you, when *they only pretend to infallibility*, and you confess that you are al *fallible* in your belief?

R. This is to be the subject of our next Conference, and therefore not now to be anticipated; only I shall tell you, that it is a meer

meer noiſe of ambiguous words to deceive the heedleſs that cannot ſearch out the meaning of them. 1. We not only *pretend*, but *profeſs* and *prove that our Chriſtian Religion* is altogether *infallible*. For which end I have written divers Treatiſes my ſelf. 2. And we profeſs that all the myſtical Church of Chriſt (that is, all ſincere Chriſtians) do truly and *infallibly believe* all that is *eſſential to Chriſtianity*, and as much of the *integrals* as they can know. 3. And we profeſs that the *Catholick Church-Viſible* (that is, *All profeſſors of Chriſtianity in the World*) do *profeſs all the eſſentials* of *Chriſtianity*, and are *infallible in this profeſſion*.

But we hold withal, that there is no particular *Church*, or *Biſhop*, no *Synod* or *Council*, that is *ſo infallible*, but that, 1. They that hold to the *eſſentials* may miſunderſtand and err about ſome *integrals*: 2. And thoſe *perſons* have no certainty that they ſhall not err by Hereſie or Apoſtacy from the eſſentials themſelves: So that the *Church* is *infallible*, becauſe it is *eſſentiated* by *believing an infallible Word*; which who ever believeth not, ceaſeth to be of the *Church*: not *Gods Word infallible*, becauſe the *Church* or any *number* of men *believe* it, or ſay its true: For *Truth* is before *Knowledge* and *Faith*: As *Ariſtotle* was a Philoſopher, becauſe he underſtood and

taught the Doctrine of real Philosopy; and not that doctrine called Physicks, or Philosophy, because that *Aristotle* knew or taught it.

But, alace, What work shall I show you when I come to open their bewildring uncertainties?

D. But to deal freely with you, me thinks their way of measuring out the *Necessaries* in Faith and Religion, according to mens various parts and opportunities, seemeth to me more satisfactory then yours, who fix upon certain points (as the *baptismal Covenant*) as *essentials*. For there is great diversity of mens capacities.

R. This cometh from confounding several Questions as if they were all one.

1. It is one Question, *What is the Christian Religion?*

2. Note. It is another Question, Whether the Christian Religion be absolutely necessary to the salvation of all those to whom it was never competently revealed?

3. And it is another Question, Whether more then the essentials of Christian Religion be not necessary to the salvation of many who have opportunity to know more? Alace, what work doth Confusion make in the World!

To the first, It is evident that as Mahometanism is a thing which may be defined, so much

much more may *Christianity*: Who that writeth of the several Religions of the World, Ethnick, Jewish, Mahometan, and Christian, do not take them to be distinguishable and *discernable*? Especially when Christ hath summed up *Christianity* into a *Covenant*, and given it us in expres words, and affixed a flat promise of salvation to the true *Covenanters*, and the Church hath ever called our Baptism, our *Christening*? Is Christianity nothing? If something, Why may it not be defined, and differenced from all false Religions? And if so, It hath its essential constitutive parts. All this is plain to Children that will see.

2. And then as to the second Question, it concerneth not our Controverse at all. It is but whether any Infidels may be saved? Or any that are no Christians? And if it could be proved, that any are saved that are no Christians, do you thereby prove that they are Christians, or members of the Christian Church? or that Christianity is not a Religion which may be defined?

3. And as to the third Question, We are on all sides agreed in it, That they that have more then the *naked essentials* of Christianity revealed to them aptly, are bound to believe more: Yea, it is hardly conceiveable that any one should know and believe the essentials only, and no more: It is not essential to the

Christian Covenant or Christianity to know that the Name of Christs Mother was *Mary*; or that *Pontius Pilate* was the man that condemned him; And if an ignorant man thought that his continuance in the Grave was four days, I do not think that this would damn his Soul to Hell: (Much less the not believing that *Mary* died a Virgin.) And yet it is not like that any man should come to the Essentials of Christianity by any such way, as should acquaint him with no one of these, or any point besides the said Essentials.

And yet it is certain for all this, that he that *truly receiveth the Essentials*, and is *true to the Baptismal Covenant*, *shall be saved*, whatsoever else he want: But it is as true, that he that *receiveth the Essentials will* (from the same *principles* and *obligations*) receive *more*, when it is aptly notified to him: And he that truly Covenanteth, will honestly keep the Covenant he maketh; which bindeth him still to learn of Christ But if any man be saved without the *Essentials*, he must be saved without Christianity.

D. But you know that they distinguish of faith *Explicite* and *Implicite*: He may be *implicitely* a Christian that believeth not the Essentials *explicitely*; as long as he believeth that which would infer them, if they were made known to him to be indeed the Word of God.

R. Thus

R. Thus do *words* abuſe and cheat the ignorant: Could you but read their own Dr. *Holden* before cited in his *Analyſ. fid.* you would find this diſtinction juſtly rendred by him ſhameful and ridiculous, according to their common ſenſe and uſe of it; and the truer ſenſe delivered and vindicated: An *implicite faith* or *knowledge* we confeſs to be true, as it is oppoſed to 1. A *diſtinct*, or 2. To a *well-expreſſed* faith or knowledge. For it is *Implicite*, Note. 1. As to the *Object*, when a *man knoweth the whole matter*, but not by *diſtinct parts*: As a man may know a Cup of water, and not know how many drops or drams it is; or he may know a ſentence, and not know how many letters are in it. 2. Or it is *Implicite* as to the *Act*, when it is yet but a *crude* imperfect conception, and the *thing* is *really* known, but not the *Logical notions*, or Grammatical names, either the *verba oris* or *mentis*, by which it ſhould be expreſſed: So that the man cannot notifie his knowledge to another. Theſe two are called *Implicite*; the firſt ſignifieth *Confuſed* and *general Knowledge*, and the other *imperfect* and *undigeſted*.

Apply this to Mr. Johnſons *Rejoynder on this Point, and you will ſee his vanity.*

But to call that *implicite faith* or *knowledge*, which extendeth only to ſome *Principles*, and

not to the *Concluſions themſelves*, is 1. To call *No-knowledge* and *faith*, by the name of *knowledge* and faith. 2. And by their application to confound the *World* and the *Church*, and to make all the Infidels and Heathens to be Chriſtians, and every Fool a Philoſopher.

For, 1. All men of Reaſon know theſe two Principles (who own a God.) 1. *That God is not a Lyer, but all his Word is True.* 2. *That all the Truths in the World are Gods, ſome way or other revealed by him.* Therefore, if they knew that the Goſpel were *Gods Word*, they would believe it: or if they knew it to be one of thoſe Truths that are in the World, they would take it to be of God. And thus all Infidels, and Turks, and Pagans may (by ſuch abuſe) be called *implicite Chriſtians*.

But why then do the Papiſts burn the *Proteſtants?* when if their Religion were true, we are all implicitely Papiſts. For we believe, 1. That all Divine Revelations are true; 2. And that all thoſe are infallible whom God hath promiſed to make infallible; 3. And that all thoſe muſt be believed and obeyed whom God hath commanded us to believe and obey; 4. And that we muſt not forſake that Church which God hath commanded us to adhere to; 5. And that all our lawfull Paſtors muſt be reverenced and ſubmitted to; 6. And all their lawfull Precepts obeyed.

7. And

7. And all Gods Sacraments holily uſed;
8. And all Traditions from the Apoſtles to the Churches received; with many more ſuch; Only we know not that the Pope is our Paſtor, or that his Councils are the Church, or have a promiſe of infallibility; and ſo of the reſt. And yet we muſt burn for it, if they can procure it. And yet he is a true believer implicitely who believeth not the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity.

But the *Deſign* which is predominant here is too viſible, when this implicite faith cometh to be deſcribed: For it is not a Belief in God, or in Chriſt only that will ſerve the turn, but it muſt be a belief in *the Church*, and *their Church*, and their Pope too, or elſe it will not do The implicite faith is the explicite belief of theſe three Articles: 1. All Gods Word is true: 2. All that is Gods Word, which the Church tells us is Gods Word. 3. The Pope and his Council and Subjects are this Church. And yet this man muſt be ſuppoſed if he know no more, *per impoſſible*, not to know that there is a Chriſt, or who he is as to his Perſon or Office, or what he hath done, or will do for us: And yet that he hath a *Vicar* and a *Church*. Or elſe they may know Chriſt and Chriſtianity before they know that there is any Pope or Church, and then the Pope hath loſt the game.

D. But

D. But if Popery be ſo ſenſeleſs a thing as you make it, how come ſo great a number of perſons of ranks and qualities, Kings, Nobles, learned Men, and Religiouſly-diſpoſed perſons to embrace it? Have not they ſouls to ſave or loſe as well as you? and do they not lay all their hopes of Heaven upon it? and can ſuch perſons, and ſo many, be ſo mad and ſenſeleſs?

R. Do we need thus to ramble round about, as if we would doubt of the *thing* till we know the *Cauſes* of it? when *we ſee* and they all confeſs that they deny all our ſenſes? Will you not believe that there is a Sun, till you know what it is made of? Or whether the Sea ebb and flow, till you know the *Cauſes* of it? I pray you tell me,

Q. 1. Do you think that the Mahometans is not a very fooliſh Religion, and their *foundation* (the pretended Miſſion of their Prophet) without any ſhew of truth; and his Alcoran (if ever you read it) a heap of Nonſenſe and Confuſion?

D. Yes: I think it deſerveth no better thoughts.

R. And do you not know that (though it aroſe not till about ſix hundred years after Chriſt) much more of the World is Mahometan then Chriſtian? And are there not far greater Emperors and Princes, Mahometans then

then any that are Christians? And have not all these souls to save or lose? And do they not all venture their souls upon that Religion? Why then is not your Argument here as good for Mahometanism as for Popery?

D. Though the Emperours of *Constantinople*, the great Mogul, the Persian, Tartarian, Mahometans, &c. be all great as to their vast Dominions, yet they are barbarous and unlearned in comparison of the Papists.

R. 1. It is not because they have not as much wit as we: but because they think that our *laborious wordy* kind of learning, is an abuse of wit, and against true Policy, ludicrously or contentiously diverting mens minds and time from those employments, which they think more manly and profitable to the Common-wealth; Though no doubt but they do err more unmanly on that extream. But I further ask you;

Q. 1. Do you not think that the common Religion of the Heathens is very unworthy for any wise man to venture his soul upon? If you have but read how it is described by the ancient Christians, *Justin*, *Athenagoras*, *Origen*, *Arnobius*, *Minutius*, *Felix*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, *Eusebius*, *Augustine*, &c. you will say that they thought it a ridiculous unmanly Religion.

D. I think no better of it then they did.

R. And

R. And 1. Do you not know that almoſt all the World was then Heathen and Idolaters? Alace, what was *Judea* (leſs then *England*) to all the World? Was not the *Roman* Empire, and *Alexanders* before that, far greater then any Chriſtian Prince hath now? And to this day, are not four ſixth parts of the whole World (at leaſt) Heathens and Idolaters? *Brierwoods* Calculation is, that if you divide the World into thirty parts, nineteen are Heathen, ſix Mahometans, and five only Chriſtians of all ſorts: beſides the vaſt unknown parts of the World, which are not like to have any Religion of ſupernatural Revelation.

2. And do you not know that *Athens* and *Rome* Heathen were no Barbarians, but of moſt polite literature, and the Fathers of the Learning now in uſe; and that when the Chriſtians aroſe among them, they accounted them Barbarians? And at this day, and long before us, the *Chinenſes* have been addicted to Arts and Literature: And the *Brachmanes* and *Bonzii* are no Barbarians. And have not all theſe ſouls to ſave or loſe? And are all theſe ſo mad as to caſt away their ſouls upon a ſenſeleſs contemptible Religion? If your reaſon be good, how much more will it hold for the Heathens, then the Papiſts? Alace, what a handful are the Papiſts in com-

pariſon

pariſon of the preſent Idolaters! much more in compariſon of the *ancient Heathen World*, before *Chriſtianity* and *Mahometaniſm* diſpoſſeſſed them of thoſe parts which they now hold!

With what greater ſhew of advantage did the Heathens uſe the Arguments which the Papiſts do now put their truſt in, and lay their Cauſe upon!

1. Do they talk of *Antiquity*? Why, it was the *Novelty* of *Chriſtianity* in compariſon of Heatheniſm through the World, which was it that hardned them to contemn and perſecute it.

2. Do they talk of *Univerſality* and *Conſent*? Alace, how little a part of the World were the Chriſtians at firſt, and are the Papiſts now, in compariſon of the Heathens, then and now?

3. Do they talk of Greatneſs, Empire, Acts and Learning? How little are they as to the firſt, to the Heathen Empires? And for Learning, they received it of them: And *Ariſtotle* ſtill is the Schoolmens Oracle. And yet doubtleſs all theſe advantages are not ſufficient to diſprove the follies of Heatheniſm, nor the badneſs of their Religion? And yet will ſo much leſs ſerve to ſupport the credit of ſenſeleſs Popery?

D. But *Chriſtians* may well expect greater helps

helps from God, then Heathens or Mahometans: Therefore that so many great and learned, and religious Christians should go such a senseless way to another World, me thinks seemeth strange.

R. And are not *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Syrians*, *Abassines* and *Protestants*, all *Christians* as well as they? Their proud schismatical unchristening all but the subjects of the Pope, is a silly proof that we are no Christians, or that they are any better then others; unless Malignity, uncharitableness and Schism be the true Excellency.

1. And are not other Christians *more* then the Papists? Bishop *Bramhall* reckons the Papists to be about the fifth part of Christians: Suppose they be a third part? They are still the *minor* part.

2. And are not the Protestants as learned as the Papists? Why then will not your argument hold *against them* as well as for them? Have not all these Christians souls to save or lose? And do they not take that for the true Religion on which they trust their souls?

D. But though all these set together are more then the Church of *Rome*, yet no one Sect of them is so great; and what matter is it how many various Sects are?

R. 1. The Greek Church is judged by wise men, to be yet bigger then the Roman, even

even in this its broken ſtate: But there is no doubt, but it was much bigger long after the firſt diviſion, before the Turk did win the Eaſtern Empire.

2. But if it were not ſo, your objection is frivolous. The Queſtion is either of *different Churches*, or of *different Opinions*, and *parties* in the *ſame Church*. As to the firſt, There are but two Opinions in the Chriſtian world, that I know of, about the Conſtitution of the *Catholick Church*. The one is the opinion of the *Papiſts only*. *Note*, that *the Catholick Church is eſſentially conſtituted* both of *Chriſt*, *and the Pope as his Vicar and univerſal Monarch*, with all *his Subjects*; as the *pars Imperans* and *pars ſubdita*.

The other is the judgement of all other Chriſtians, (that I know or hear of,) that *the Catholick Church is eſſentially conſtituted only of Chriſt as the ſupream Head, or King*, or *pars Imperans*, and *his Subjects* as the *pars ſubdita*. *Note*. And that Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, &c. are but *Officiales & ſubditi primatii vel nobiles*, *conſtitutive parts indeed of their particular Churches* (ſome humane, and ſome Divine) but no *eſſential* parts of the *Catholick Church*.

Note. This is the grand difference between the Papiſts and all other Chriſtians in the World, *What the Catholick Church is? Whether*

it

it have any constitutive universal Head or Monarch beside Christ? Now seeing that *Greeks, Abassines, Armenians*, and all agree with us in this against the Papists. it is evident to them that are willing to see that we are all of the same *Catholick Church*, though not of the same particular Churches, nor all for the same Official Ministers; Because we are all for the same constitutive *Head*, and his *subjects as such*, and agree in all the Essential parts. *Note.* So that our differences among all these parties or particular Churches, or Countries, is but the difference of *Opinions* and *parties in one and the same Church*; and not a difference of Catholick Churches (which can be but one.)

And if that be the question, I undertake to prove that there is no one Sect of Christians known under Heaven, that hath so many different opinions within it self, (if half so many,) nor have written half so much against one another, as the Papists have done.

3. But I must not here anticipate my further work: when I come to that, I shall show you how *small* and how *disagreeing* a part of the Christian World the Papists are. I have elsewhere recited the words of their *Melchior Canus*, who boasteth that the Papacy yet standeth, though almost all the World, and besides Princes, almost all the Bishop and Churches

Churches have fought againſt it. Was it then the Univerſal Church? And the words of *Reynerius* who ſaith, that the Churches of the *Armenians* and the others planted by the Apoſtles (without the Empire he meaneth) were not under the Pope of *Rome*. I ſhall, if I live to do that work, yet fullier ſhew you, that the Pope was but the chief Patriarch in one Empire, as the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* is the chief Biſhop in *England*; and that his general Councils were but general Aſſemblies of the Empire (inconſiderable occaſional accidentals excepted,) even as our Convocations, or the Scots general Aſſemblies were, though in a far larger Empire. But all this I have done already in other writings, beyond all reaſonable contradiction.

D. Tell me then, how it cometh to paſs that ſo many Princes, Nobles, learned men, and Religious, can be ſo marvellouſly deluded?

R. Alace, poor man; You talk as if you knew not your ſelf nor mankind! how bad a thing corrupt unſanctified nature is! Why do you not alſo ask, How cometh it to paſs, that the far greateſt part of the World (even five parts of ſix) are Heathens and Mahometanes! and that moſt of the World are willfull ſelf-deſtroyers; many ruining their very bodies, eating and drinking, and whoreing,

and

and idling them into Gowt, Stone, Dropſies, and an hundred Maladies; but far more ruining their ſouls. Why do you not alſo ask, How reaſonable Creatures (of all Profeſſions) are ſo worſe then mad, as to ſell their ſouls and everlaſting hopes, for a dream and ſhadow, or for dirt and dung; even for a few Cups or Morſels, or merry hours, which they know are like the mirth of drunkenneſs, which is quickly gone, and ends in ſickneſs and in ſhame! For a great Name, and a large attendance in their way to the grave! For the *thoughts* and *breath* of mortal man! And for that which all men firſt or laſt, are forced to call meer *Vanity* and *Vexation*! Were not men mad in ſin, had they never heard a Preacher, the ſight of a dead Carkaſs and a Grave would do more to make them ſober and conſiderate, then is done with moſt. When moſt of the World will obſtinately follow the Devil their enemy, by known ſin to everlaſting miſery, againſt all the commands, exhortations, promiſes, threatnings, mercies and warnings of God himſelf, and all the perſwaſions of their trueſt friends; What wonder, if the ſame men can be Papiſts or any thing?

But I will tell you ſome of the particular Cauſes.

I. Abroad in other Countries, there are all theſe Reaſons eaſily diſcernible. 1. Who knoweth

knoweth not how great an advantage *Education* hath, to form mens judgements to almoſt any thing, how bad ſoever? That which children receive, if it be not diſagreeable to their ſenſible intereſt, how commonly and tenaciouſly do they follow? Whence is it that the whole Empires and Kingdoms of Pagans are all of one mind; and the Kingdoms of Mahometans of another? One Kingdom almoſt all Greek Chriſtians, and another Papiſts, and another Lutherans, and another Reformiſts, &c. Hath not education a great hand in this?

2. And the *cuſtome* of the Countrey, and the *company* which they converſe with, is of no ſmall power with mens minds. Eſpecially when men live where almoſt all *are of a mind*, they think that *concord* is a ſign of *truth*, and *modeſty* forbiddeth them to be wiſer then all the Countrey.

3. And when they know few or none of another mind, how ſhould they know what they are? And when they hear an hundred lies againſt them, and never hear them ſpeak for themſelves, they think that the Law of modeſty, humanity & converſe, oblige them to believe, that ſo many, ſo great, and ſo learned and religious Perſons will not impudently lye: When as perhaps the lye it ſelf is a *Tradition*, which the lyars received on the

ſame

ſame terms in modeſt credulity from their Teachers or Fathers.

4. And ſpecially, the Names of *Order*, *Government*, *Unity*, and *Concord*, deceive many millions of ſouls: For *Order* and *Unity* are juſtly amiable to nature it ſelf. And the purblind know not an *Image* from a *Man*.

5. Eſpecially when civil Wars, or Church diſcords have diſtracted the World, and made men a weary of all thats *preſent*, and ſuſpicious of all things, which ſeemed to have a hand in their diſappointments; this maketh men hearken to any thing which pretendeth to *certain ſettlement*, *Order* and *peace*. Even as a man that by turning round is wheel-ſick, will lay hold on the next poſt or fixed thing, to keep him from falling down.

6. And when their Teachers make them believe, that all Chriſtians beſides them do live like madmen, in Sects and Schiſmes, diſtractedly tearing out one anothers throats, What wonder, if this make men willing of any way which pretends to peace, and glad to run into any Cottage which will keep them from ſuch a ſtorm?

7. But the great cauſe is, 1. The *Blindneſs* of mens minds, 2. The *wickedneſs* of all unrenewed hearts, and 3. The *power* of *carnal intereſt*.

1. Few men are of *great natural parts* for wit,

wit, and fewer *improve* them, by any ſerious ſtudy of things ſpiritual.

2. Almoſt all men ſtudy with the byas of *prejudice* and *partiality*, and as men that *would* have *one ſide* to be *right*, becauſe it is for their worldly ends.

3. Sin ruleth in moſt ſouls, and the enmity againſt God and his Laws prevaileth in carnal minds, *Rom.* 8. 6. 7. 8. And *enmity* is an ill ſtudent and ſeeker of truth; and friendſhip is an incompetent judge of ſin.

4. None but a few ſelf-denying perſons can bear to be reproached, as Hereticks and Schiſmaticks by all about them.

5. Eſpecially the countenance or diſcountenance of *Great ones*, doth more with ſuch then Heaven and Hell.

6. And that is not all, But he that will not be a Papiſt, in moſt of their Countreys muſt be *undone*, and in many muſt be *racks*, *tormented* and *burnt*: And it is but few that have [illegible] go to ſo high a price for truth, and to be religious at ſuch a rate.

8. Therefore it is a thing utterly *unknown* among them, *who is heartily* a Papiſt, and *who not*. For when men *muſt take on them* to be Papiſts or be *undone*, or *burnt*, millions will ſeem to be ſuch that are not. For,

9. Moſt of the World have *no Religion in truth and power*, to overcome the world and fleſh:

fleſh: and therefore will ſeem to be of that Religion, which hath the upper hand, and ſerveth their turns.

10. Yea, the very *Belief* of the *immortality of the ſoul*, the *Reſurrection and the life to come*, is feeble, if not unſound and lifeleſs, in the moſt of men: And ſo is the Belief of the *Chriſtian faith*: And a man that doubteth whether there be *another life or not*, will make as ſure as he can of the pleaſures of *this preſent* life. And I fear that this is the caſe of no ſmall number of Papiſts; to think, *I know not whether there be any other life of retribution: I rather think that there is none: But leſt it ſhould prove true, I will be of ſome Religion: And where can I be with more eaſe and ſafety, then in that which my Rulers and Teachers and the whole Countrey ſay is right? If it prove otherwiſe, I hope God will excuſe me, while I obey my Governours, and do as the moſt do.* He that much doubteth of the truth of *Chriſtianity it ſelf*, may eaſily fall in with any Sect which ſeemeth for his intereſt. I fear *Melanthon* too truly ſaid, that *Italians maintain that Chriſt is in the Sacrament, when they do not believe that he is in Heaven.*

11. And many *Nicodemites* think, that a man needs not expoſe himſelf to danger for his faith, but may keep it to himſelf, and do as his neighbours do; eſpecially where they have

have no other ſociety to joyn with, they think it better to joyn with the Popiſh Churches then none.

12. And I have reaſon to think that it is but few among the multitude, that *underſtand indeed* what the Papiſts hold, while they go with them in the *general Name* and profeſſion: And in particular about Tranſubſtantiation: When even the ſubtile School-men are not agreed of its proper ſenſe; (as *Durandus* his inſtance for one doth prove.) I do not think that one of an hundred that receiveth their Euchariſt, doth in his heart believe, that *it is not Bread*: But ſome think that their Church it ſelf *meaneth otherwiſe*: And ſome ſay, [It is not for ſuch as I to contradict them and diſpute; but I will leave every one to think as he will; and ſo will I.]

13. And as for *Princes* and *Lords* abroad, Thoſe that have once eſcaped Popery will take heed how they entertain it again, unleſs *luſt and folly* have ſold them for a prey? But they that live where their *Subjects* are *Papiſts*, dare not venture to ſhake ſo great a fabrick, leſt they overthrow themſelves:

For 1, People are tumultuous;

2. The Popiſh Clergie are rich and powerfull and exceeding numerous.

3. Religion is a thing that men are tender and tenacious of, who are ſeriouſly of any.

4. The Popiſh Doctrine of depoſing and killing excommunicate Kings, maketh many Princes flatter the Prieſts, for fear of loſing their lives. They think that it is better make ſome advantage of the Popes friendſhip, then to have ſuch an enemy, whoſe Knives and poiſon have eaſie acceſs, and whoſe armies we muſt watch againſt in peace, as in a continued War, and we know not when they are in our own houſes or near us, nor where, nor when we are in ſafety.

14. And, alace, the Great ones of the World have the *greateſt Temptations*, and not the *weakeſt luſts* and *paſſions*, and have more of *worldly and carnal Intereſt* to carry them away!

15. And the Papiſts Religion is notably ſuited to their *luſts and carnal ends*: All which, & much more, may tell you that it's no wonder, that ſo many forreign Princes, and States and Nobles can cleave to ſo ſenſleſs a way as Popery.

D. II. But how come ſo many among us in *England* to turn Papiſts of late years, where Popery is diſcountenanced by the King, Parliament and Laws?

R. Many of the ſame Cauſes do this, which I need not rehearſe. And 1. Too many both *Noble* and *ignoble* are *prepared by their Luſts, and by a vicious life.* There are many things

in

in Popery which greatly accommodate a carnal mind, and a debauched guilty Conſcience, which the *Chriſtian Proteſtant* Religion affordeth not. And a proffligate flagitious perſon, is likelieſt to be *forſaken of God*, and to be given up to believe a lye, ſeeing they received not the truth in the love of it, that they might be ſaved, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10, 11, 12. I fear nothing ſo much, as leſt men turn *Heart-Infidels* and *Tongue-Papiſts* (as the ſuitableſt *reſerve*, leſt *Chriſtian Religion* and the *life to come*, ſhould prove a truth.) And indeed great ſins Cry for great vengeance: And what greater then for *Mind*, *Will* and *Life* to be forſaken of God?

2. And alace, except Lawyers, Phyſitians and others, bred up to Studies and employments, how few are there of Nobility or Gentry that are *hard ſtudying* men! And the great Myſteries of Religion will not be *well learned* and *defended*, by a life of eating, drinking, playing, jeaſting, gaming, hawking, hunting, viſitings of empty company, luſtfulneſs, worldlineſs, or vain glorious pomp. No men grow *wiſe* or *Chriſtians* indeed by ſuch a courſe.

3. And indeed, the *Popiſh Prieſts* are more *induſtrious* then too many of our *incumbent* Miniſters; for which they are commendable in their way: The Erroneous are oft more

zealous then the Orthodox. And they that apprehend themſelves between fear and hope, are uſually more *induſtrious* then they that by *poſſeſſion* are *ſecure*: which maketh the *lower ſide* ſo oft get up, and the *upper ſide* go down. And I would I might not ſay, that our Miniſters are too few of them *able to deal* with a trained Sophiſter: Some are unable in this *particular cauſe*, becauſe they take it as a baffled pack of notorious errors, & thought that few ſober perſons were in danger of it: And ſo they have (honeſtly) bent their ſtudies and labours to the winning of ſenſual perſons from their ſins; and are unfurniſhed in the Popiſh Controverſies; knowing that they can refer them to multitudes of Books, which are unanſwerable. But alace, too many alſo are unable through *meer ignorance*, *lowneſs of parts*, *and groſs inſufficiency* or *negligence*, not only in this, *but other parts of their Miniſterial work*.

4. And we have incurred no ſmall dammage and danger, by *ignorant over-doing* againſt the Papiſts: Partly with the *ſelf-wiſe Sectaries*, calling many laudable or blameleſs things, by the name of *Popery*, *Antichriſtianity* and *Idolatry*, becauſe they are croſs to their pre-judging partial conceits: And partly by ſome *unſound Doctrines*, which ſome defend as parts of the Proteſtant Religion:

And

And partly by *magnifying verbal differences*, and making a noiſe about them, as if they were real, and ſuch as ſalvation lyeth on: For want of *skill to ſtate a controverſie*, & diſcern a *verbal* difference from a *real*. *And when a Papiſt can but ſhew their Novices one ſuch palpable error in the Writings of a Proteſtant: What ſad work will he make with it? and ſtill harp upon that ſtring, and perſwade the people that the reſt of our differences are ſuch like.* And thus many *over-doing* well-meaning ignorant men both Miniſters and people, have unwittingly done as much to harden Papiſts, and increaſe their numbers, almoſt as if Satan had hired them as Spies, to betray the Churches and Cauſe of Chriſt: Yea, and if one better ſtudied in theſe points, ſhall go a ſounder and more ſucceſsful way to work, and take theſe weapons out of the Papiſts hands, which ſome ignorant Proteſtants have given them, the ſame mens blind zeal will rage againſt them, (as ſome did againſt *Chillingworth*, *Anthony Wotton*, and divers others our greateſt Champions) as if it were not *themſelves* but *theſe*, that were befriending Popery. *So that they neither can confute them ſoundly themſelves, nor will ſuffer others, but zealous Proteſtants aſſault Chriſts ableſt ſervants at their backs, while their faces are towards the adverſaries whom they oppoſe.*

5. But nothing among us (except *ignorance* and *wickedness*) increaseth them more, then the *scandal* of our *numerous*, and some of them *abominable Sects*. When the people see many zealous professors turn Quakers, or Ranters, or Seekers, or Antinomians, or Socinians, or Familists; and shall see the more tolerable parties (*Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independant, Erastian, Separatists*, and *Anabaptists*) condemning, back-biting, reproaching and making odious (if not persecuting) one another, and shunning (many of them) the Communion of one another; as they do the Papists. This makes them think, that they must seek some surer soberer way then any of us have yet found: and the Papists set in and tell them. [*All these are branches broken off from the true Vine and withered; This it is to depart from the Catholick Church; when they are once gone thence, there is no stop or consistence, till they crumble all to dust and atomes: You must become* Roman Catholicks, *or go mad: You see to what confusion all others tend: If you once leave our Church you will never know where to settle: Which Sect will you be of? If an Independent, why not an Anabaptist? If an Anabaptist, why not an Antinomian? How will you ever know which one of all these is in the right?*] All this is easily answered by a man of understanding; But to the ignorant vulgar, it seemeth

un-

unanſwerable. And alace, how many have given them this ſcandal? *Wo be to* ſome by *whom offence cometh.*

6. But the *Contentions* of our *Clergie* advantage them more then the *diviſions* of the *people*: when we are of *many intereſt*, and many *parties*, and proceed to make each other *contemptible* and *odious*: eſpecially when we come to *hinder* each other from the *work of our Miniſtry*. *A houſe and Kingdom divided cannot ſtand*: Chriſt tells us, *that the Devil himſelf is not ſo fooliſh, as to divide his Kingdom.* *All* our *conſent* and beſt endeavour is too little to ſave mens ſouls from ſin and error: And when *one part is caſt by*, and *each part* by *contention hindereth* the other: the Papiſts have the far eaſier work. When *one part* are not to come within five miles of Cities or Corporations, where Papiſts are, and thoſe that may come near them are *too few*, and many *too indiſpoſed*, or *negligent* in reſiſting them; ſo that we are all over done by their Prieſts in conſtant diligence, (eſpecially with the *greater rank of men*, with whom *one part* of our Miniſters, have almoſt as little *inclination* as *opportunity* to converſe,) no wonder if the *Roman* work go on.

7. And, alace, how great advantage have they made of our late calamitous *Civil Wars*, and manifold ſcandalous Rebellions? Though

indeed it was the terrour of *their* murdering about *two hundred thousand* in *Ireland* (of which see Bishop *Jones*, Sir *John Temple*, and the Earl of *Orery* against *Welsh*,) which *frightened* those that I was acquainted with, out of their peace, and almost out of their wits here in *England*, yet *dead men* are not heard on Earth, and their service for the King in *England* serveth not only for a Cloak for that, but for an advantage against many that stand in their way. In all Civil Wars, if the Clergy be drawn in to own *several Causes* (especially if they own an *ill Cause*) who ever prevaileth, Religion suffereth by it; while *one part* of them are laid by, or hindered by the other.

8. And though God hath greatly obliged this Nation to thankfulness, by preserving our Superiours so much from Popery as he hath done, yet some of their names are injuriously abused, to entice men to the Popish way, as if it had so much countenance and patronage, that *Interest* might invite them to it.

9. And the World is lyable to changes, and weary of holding long in one way: The *name* of *Antiquity* especially in *Religion*, is venerable with all; but yet it is *Novelty* that pleaseth in the *Matter*. And when *Popery* is *to us* a *new way* honoured with the name of *The old Religion*, it is a taking bait. 10.

10. But the grand cause of all, is the *common peoples ignorance*, as being ungrounded in their own Religion; and their *badness*, who measure all by carnal Interests, and *all our great and manifold sins*, by which we have forfeited Gods presence and his grace, and provoked him to leave us to the shame and ruine of our own lusts, and delusions to undo our selves. Great sins bring great plagues. And most men are of *their* Religion who have the *greatest interest* in their *estimation* and *affections*, or that have greatest *advantage* on them by *constant nearness*, *familiarity*, *kindred*, *kindness*, or *power to do them good or hurt* in the World.

And therefore to your question, *Why so many of late turn Papists?* I shall but now concludingly answer you, as I begun with you, concerning the Cause of your own doubts; *They that long lived under the light of the Holy Gospel, & among the mercies which have blest this Land, and yet have been sincerely no true Christians, but loved their fleshly lusts and pleasures, and their wealth and worldly honour, more then God, or holiness, or Heaven, it is no wonder that they easily change their party, and can be, in* siding, *of* any Religion *who are in* sincerity of none; *and if God forsake their understandings, and give them up to senseless and unreasonable opinions, who would not live according to the knowledge which*

they had, nor obey the truth which was clearly opened to them. And such hypocrites and perfidious rebels against Christ, all Protestants do confess themselves to have been, who turn Papists, and know what they do; Because they profess to go from a state of damnation, into a Church out of which there is no salvation; *if the Popes judgement be as powerful in Heaven, as it is at* Rome.

D. But is there no hope of ending these lamentable differences, and removing the scandal of Infidels hereby? or at least of living together like Neighbours without seeking each others blood or ruine?

R. 1. Yes, when God shall by his providence take down the worldly greatness and advantages of the Papacy, and level the King of *Rome* with the true Pastors of his Church, and turn the usurping Monarch of all the World into a true Bishop; that so worldly Power, honour and wealth, may not be stronger Arguments with their party then Heaven and Hell, and Gods commands. Till then their great twisted Interest is like to rule them, and keep them in the errors into which it hath involved them. Especially while their pretended *infallibility* (against all sense and reason) is their strength, which maketh them uncurable in any errour which they once embrace.

2. But

2. But yet I did in the ſecond Part of my *Key for Catholicks*, long ago ſhew the terms on which we may live like *neighbours*, if not like *Chriſtians*, if their principles would allow their *minds*, to be but peaceable, and give diſſenters leave to live.

And I ſtill profeſs that *might we but ſecure our ſelves* and *our poſterity* I am none of thoſe that would have the leaſt *injury*, much leſs *cruelty* exerciſed upon any man for being a Papiſt: If they will live peaceably with me, or but give me leave, I will live peaceably with them. And I doubt not but as there are ſome among them truly fearing God (though corrupt with the errours of their education) ſo there are more that *are* of kind and civil natures, which their ill opinions cannot make fierce and ſanguinary nor overcome. And none of them, I think, ſhall be more loving, kind and peaceable to me, then I will be to him.

And I confeſs, I have a greater reſpect and honour for thoſe, whoſe Anceſtors have tranſmitted Popery to them, under the name of the true Catholick faith, and who live according to what they know (though perhaps in blind zeal they hate me, and ſuch others for the intereſt of their way,) then I have for thoſe that ſeemed once Proteſtants, and by filthy debauched lives have made it ſeem

needful or *convenient* for them to turn Papists, that they may have a seeming Religion, and Priests pardons to quiet or deceive their Consciences; or then I have for those Papists who live in drunkenness, lust and common lying, and prophane swearing, while yet they seem to be Religious and regardful of God and their souls; or then I have for those Priests who befriend such mens wickedness for the increase and interest of their Church.

Yea, I truly profess, that if I know a truly Godly conscionable charitable a Papist, I must, I will love and honour him far more then an ungodly, unconscionable, uncharitable Protestant. And as far as I can discern, both Ministers and private Christians (but especially Ministers) whom I most converse with, are of the same mind.

D. But is there no way possible to bring them fairly off, in this gross business of Transubstantiation, without putting them upon the disclaiming of the Popes and General Councils infallibility?

R. I am not bound to devise accomodations, to strengthen them in their other errors, if I could. But yet I would cure any errour in any, though they intend their own cure to an evil end. I cannot be perswaded, but their understanding men are sorry at the heart, that the *Laterane* Council hath drawn them

them into ſuch a ſnare, by making Tranſubſtantiation an Article of their faith; and that they are very angry at them, and wiſh that it had never been done: but being done they muſt take on them to believe it, leſt they pull down with their foundation all their fabrick. I doubt not but they are troubled and aſhamed to read the Schoolmens diſputes of Tranſubſtantiation, expoſing Chriſtianity to the Infidels ſcorn, which this Council hath moſt occaſioned. I know not how to bring them off, unleſs they will hearken to what Dr. *Taylor* in his Diſſwaſive from Popery, and Dr. *Heylin*, and Dr. *Pierſon* and Dr. *Gunning* in the Diſpute, have ſaid againſt the Validity of that *Laterane* Council (could they but ſpare the Canon for depoſing temporal Lords, and diſpoſſeſſing them of their Dominions, and abſolving all their Papiſts Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and exterminating the reſt; Yea, it would be more ſerviceable to them at laſt with Princes, to retract that alſo, then to keep it.) Their beſt way is to take the help of theſe pretences, and condemn the contrary Reaſons of Mr. *Terret* and his fellow Diſputant againſt the foreſaid Doctors, and expunge that Council out of *Binnius*, *Surius*, and the reſt who number it with the approved Councils; and becauſe *Matth. Paris* and others ſay, that ſome

at

at the Council thought the Canons burdenſom, and they were brought in by the Pope, and haſtily read, &c. therefore ſay, that they were not paſſed at leaſt *Conciliariter*, which you know is a word that ſerveth their turn againſt another Council which they diſlike.

D. But what ſhall they do with following Councils, eſpecially that at *Trent*, which ſay the ſame?

R. The beſt ſhifts that I know are, 1. To do as they do about the condemning of Pope *Honorius* as a Heretick. They ſay that a general Council and Pope too may err in a matter of fact; and ſo they did in judging of *Honorius* his meaning: So they may ſay, that the Council of *Trent* did decree this as an Article of faith, only becauſe they thought that the Church ſo held it: which was becauſe they thought that the general approved Council of *Laterane* had ſo decreed it: But now finding that it was not ſo decreed there, the error in matter of fact ceaſing, which was the ſuppoſition, the doctrinal error proveth to be no Article of faith, or *Conciliariter decretum.*

2. Or if this will not do, they are beſt yet ſtretch the words of *Rome* and *Trent*, to a more tolerable ſignification, and ſay, That it is not the ceaſing of the ſubſtance of Bread and

and Wine which is meant; but the changing it into a Relative new form: And ſo, as the *whole ſubſtance of a man is changed* from being a meer Common man, *into a King, a Biſhop*, a *Doctor*, without any ceſſation of his humanity; but only *quia forma ultima denominat*, he is not any more to be called meerly *a Man*, but *a King*, *a Biſhop*, &c. Or, as the *whole ſubſtance of a piece of gold is changed into currant Coin by the Kings Stamp*, &c. *So the whole ſubſtance of Bread is turned into the* (*Repreſentative*) *Body of Chriſt, and the whole ſubſtance of Wine into his* (*Repreſentative*) *blood*; *which change* they call *Tranſubſtantiation*.

But why ſhould I give counſel to men that will not thank me for it, and that obſtinately refuſe much better?

D. But why ſpeak you nothing of their denying the people the Cup? I thought you would principally have faſtned on that.

R. Becauſe it is no part of this preſent Controverſie, which I was firſt to handle, though it concern the ſame Sacrament: But it is ſuch an inſtance, as ſerveth to tell thoſe of the World that will underſtand, what horrid *unreaſonable*, *audacious arrogance* and *Uſurpation*, and *Treaſon againſt God* and the *true Head* of the *Church*, this pretended Monarch of the World, and his pretended Catholick Church, the Popiſh Sect, are guilty of: conſidering, 1. That

1. That it is as *essential* a part of the Sacrament as the *Bread* is: For Christ hath made no difference.

2. It hath the same Institution and express Command: He that said, [*Take, Eat*] said also [*Drink ye all of this:*] He hath said [*Do this in remembrance of me*] of *one* as well as of the *other*.

3. Therefore to take away an *essential part*, is to take away the Sacrament, and make it another thing. As it is not a humane body that hath not both *Head* and *Heart*: So here.

4. Therefore by the same authority they might have continued the *Cup*, & taken away the *Bread*; or have taken away both.

5. And on the same reason they might have taken away Baptism, and all Christs positive Institutions. And for ought I know the Ministry it self as instituted.

6. But then *Gersons* question, *de auferabilitate Papæ* would be next to be debated: For were he of *Christs own institution*, as he is not, it is no more then the Cup in the Lords Supper, Could he but prove an institution of his Papacy as evidently, who would not be his Subject? If you say, But who should take him down, if it might be done? I answer, Kings in their own Kingdoms, and his own general Councils. The Kings of *France*, *Spain*, &c. may easily prove, that they have more power to

to cast out the Pope, then he hath to cast out half Christs Sacrament: And they may better forbid their own Subjects to obey a forreign Usurper, then he can forbid all the world to obey Christ.

7. And for all this, the wit of man can hardly devise *what Reason they have to do it?* What point of their Religion? What interest of their own did engage them to it? Unless it be their interest to shew that they are *above* Christ and the Scripture, I do not yet discern their reason.

8. And yet they have, with Resolution and obstinacy, persisted herein divers hundreds of years, and denyed the requests of Emperors, Nobles, and great part of several Kingdoms in this point.

This and the leaving out the second Commandment, seem to be of purpose to shew that they are above the Maker of the Ten Commandments and of the Gospel. How long Lord shall tyranny oppress the Nations of the earth, and the *Honour* and *Domination* and *Wills* of Rebels, prevail to tread down Truth and Godliness, and keep the notice of thy salvation from the sinful miserable world; whilest yet we daily pray by thy Command, that *Thy Name may be hallowed, Thy Kingdom come, and Thy will be done, on Earth as it is done in Heaven?*

Whether

Whether the Pope be the Antichriſt meant in the Scripture, (by that name) or not, you ſee that my paſſing it by doth ſhew my cautelouſneſs in reſolving (as *Zanchy* and others before me have done,) becauſe I am confeſſedly ſo far unſtudyed or ignorant of the ſenſe of the *Revelations*, and ſome other Scripture Prophecies, as that I muſt leave ſuch caſes to ſuch as Biſhop *Downame* and others, that have deeper inſight into them: Every man ſhould be beſt at that which he hath moſt ſtudyed. But I muſt needs ſay, that though I take it to be indiſpenſible duty, to keep up all due charity to all profeſſed Chriſtians; ſuch inſtances as theſe which I have here opened do utterly diſable me from confuting that man, who ſhall aſſert that this pretended Vicar of Chriſt, and King or Monarch of the World, (and ſo King of Kings, and Lord of Lords) is an abominable Uſurper, and inſolent Traytor, againſt God, and the true King and Head of the Univerſal Church. How long will Princes and Prelates, learned and unlearned be deluded by him, or fear Power? And when ſhall he be reſtrained from hindering Chriſts Goſpel, and the Peace and Concord of the Chriſtian World?

THE

THE CONTENTS.

PART I.

WHat is the Proteſtants Religion, and what the Papiſts? pag. 1.

Chap. 1. *The occaſion of ths Conference: with an humbling conſideration to ſtaggerers.* ibid.

Chap. 2. *The Conditions of the Conference.* p. 8.

Chap. 3. *What is the Religion of the Proteſtants. Of the name* Proteſtant: *The Auguſtane and other Confeſſions: The thirty nine Articles: The Eſſentials of Chriſtianity to be diſtinguiſhed from the Integrals and Accidentals.* p. 12.

Chap. 4. *What is the Papiſts Religion: out of* Veron, Davenport, &c. p. 33.

PART II.

Fourteen Principles in which the Papiſts and Proteſtants ſeem agreed; by which the Proteſtant Religion is by the Papiſts conſeſſed and maintained to be all true. p. 54.

PART III.

Twenty five Charges againſt Popery enumerated, to be all in order proved; as Reaſons why

no

The Contents.

no one that hath Religion, *or Sense and Reason, should turn Papist.* p.80.

PART IV.

The first Charge made good, viz. *against* Transubstantiation: *In which Popery is fully proved to be the shame of humane Nature; contrary to* Sense, Reason, Scripture *and* Tradition, *or the judgement of the ancient and the present Church; devised by Satan to expose Christianity to the scorn of Infidels.* p. 96.

Chap. 1. *The first Reason to prove that there is Bread after the Consecration, from the certainty of the Intellects Perception by the means of sense.* ibid.

Twenty Reasons against the denying of common senses. p. 99.

Chap. 2. *The Papists Answers to all this confuted.* p. 113.

Chap. 3. *The second Argument against Transubstantiation from the contradictions of it.* p. 124.

Chap. 4. *The third Argument from the certain falshood of their multitudes of feigned Miracles in Transubstantiation. Thirty one Miracles in it enumerated; with twenty aggravations of those Miracles.* p. 127.

Chap. 5. *The Minor proved,* viz. *That these Miracles are false or feigned,* p. 142.

Chap

Chap. 6. Arg. 4. *Tranſubſtantiation contrary to the expreſs Word of God.* p. 151.

Chap. 7. Arg 5. *All theſe Miracles are proofleſs: yea, the Scripture abundantly directeth us otherwiſe to expound,* This is my Body, p. 159.

Chap. 8. Arg. 6. *Tranſubſtantiation nullifieth the Sacrament,* p. 165.

Chap. 9. *The* Novelty *of Tranſubſtantiation, as contrary to the faith of the ancient Chriſtians: And the* ſingularity, *contrary to the Judgement and Tradition of moſt of the Chriſtian World.* p. 170.

Chap. 10. *The ſecond part of the Controverſy: That it is not Chriſts very Fleſh and Blood into which the Bread and Wine is turned,* p. 188.

Chap. 11. *The Concluſion: The Scandal of our difference removed. Whether the falſhood of one Article prove the Papiſts foundation falſe? Whether it do ſo by the Proteſtants? Whether Papiſts have any more infallibility then others? The neceſſity of diſcerning the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity. The diſtinction of Explicite and Implicite faith conſidered. How come ſo many Princes, Nobles, learned men, and whole Nations to be Papiſts? All Chriſtians beſides Papiſts, are of one Church, though of many opinions. How come ſo many among us at home of late inclinable to Popery?*

What

What hope of Concord with the Papists? How to help them off their Councils? Snares in the point of Transubstantiation. Of their denying the Cup to the Laity. p.196

FINIS.

BAXTERS ſafe Religion. &c.